



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE ROOM

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

11/2/66

OCTOBER, 1966

THE JESUIT APOSTOLATE OF EDUCATION

Role of the Jesuit
Role of the Layman

PROBLEMS OF JESUIT EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

A PSYCHIATRIST REFLECTS ON COLLEGE EDUCATION

Vol. XXIX, No. 2

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

FATHER JOHN P. LEARY, S.J. (Oregon Province) is the President of Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington.

DOCTOR CHARLES J. DONAHUE is Professor of English at Fordham University and recipient of Fordham's *Bene Merenti* citation for twenty years of service.

FATHER ANDREW M. GREELEY, priest and scholar, friend and critic, is a member of the Archdiocese of Chicago and of the National Opinion Research Center.

FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, S.J. (Missouri Province) is President of the Jesuit Educational Association and also President of Saint Louis University.

DOCTOR MANNING M. PATILLO is Associate Director of the Danforth Foundation and Director of its Commission on Church Colleges and Universities.

DOCTOR DANA L. FARNSWORTH, M.D., is the Henry K. Oliver Professor of Hygiene and the Director of University Health Services at Harvard University.

The papers published in this issue of the Quarterly were presented at the opening general session and at the sessions on Higher Education of the JEA National Meeting, Loyola University, Chicago, April 10-11, 1966. Space does not permit publication of comments on Doctor Farnsworth's paper by Father Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., President of St. Peter's College, and by Dean E. G. Williamson, Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology at the University of Minnesota. Copies of these comments are available upon request from the central office of the Association.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

October 1966

CONTENTS

THE ROLE OF THE JESUIT IN THE APOSTOLATE OF EDUCATION

John P. Leary, S.J. 81

THE ROLE OF THE LAYMAN IN THE JESUIT APOSTOLATE OF EDUCATION

Charles J. Donahue 91

THE PROBLEMS OF JESUIT EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Andrew M. Greeley 102

COMMENTS ON FATHER GREELEY'S PRESENTATION

Paul C. Reinert, S.J. 121

Manning M. Patillo 130

A PSYCHIATRIST REFLECTS ON COLLEGE EDUCATION

Dana L. Farnsworth, M.D. 135

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

A. WILLIAM CRANDELL, S.J.

Managing Editor

PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.

ADVISORY BOARD

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JOSEPH T. BROWNE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
CORNELIUS J. CARR, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
EDWARD A. DOYLE, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES E. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JAMES J. MCGINLEY, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
JOHN V. MURPHY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
JEROME A. PETZ, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

COPYRIGHT, 1966
JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

The Role of the Jesuit in the Apostolate of Education

JOHN P. LEARY, S.J.

On another Easter evening many years ago a group of men sat together in a room, puzzled, discouraged and even afraid. They were not too different from ourselves. Events for which they were, in a way, totally unprepared had abruptly laid low their hopes; and now their future, in the light of the expectations nourished by their master, could only seem bleak and improbable at best.

A shattered dream did not seem much to build tomorrow from, and these men, every James, Peter and Philip of them must have been taciturn, quarrelsome, even bitter. They were both open and closed men, as we are. Open because somehow, they had not given up, they were still together, the impact of those years with Christ could not be washed away, even by his being done brutally to death. But they were closed, too, fearful of an outside and marauding world, wounded almost mortally by the devastation of their longing through that preceding Friday. The kingdom had been almost at hand, last Sunday's tumult rang mockingly in their memories. The rude reality that this was not to be could only have been inexplicable to these good and simple fellows, innocent of divine intrigue, men without guile before a surreptitious God.

He stood before them later that night and said, "Peace." That eventually calmed them, but left much unanswered. The tremulous spirit breathed and unleashed for a moment some unthought-of splendor. He unlocked and unbolted their doors and windows. And for 40 days, in effect, he said, "Stand fast—have faith."

Through these 1933 years, we have been beneficiary to the same blessings and the same handicaps, understanding more than we can manage, overwhelmed by the enormity of our mission to do battle for His cause and beside ourselves at how often ineffective, irresolute and incompetent we are when matched against shrewder and more sophisticated foes, less principled, in a way, but more ingenious about getting what they want than we are about what we want.

Beset as we are today with stridency and the unyielding press to freedom, with a fear and dislike of dogma, with antagonism for

structure and a bias against the old, with the doubts that dog us as educators about whether the outlay in men and money and the sheer miles in energy and love is worth it, we need to be reminded that we walk in the steps of men who have known the terror of darkness, wrestled with fatigue and obscurity, wondered about when leadership meant the crystallizing of consensus and when it meant striking out alone.

The reason for our theme, this year, of the Apostolate of Jesuit Education is that people are not sure. This year's meeting is an examination on identity, that strange process of self confrontation by which persons and collectivities review their authenticity, try with candor and detachment to assess what they are doing and inquire, almost with fear, if perhaps there might not be some more fruitful arena for conquest. Right now, I think not.

And yet in the midst of such success as we are now enjoying in our 28 universities and colleges and our 53 high schools and the seminaries manned by our fathers, with never so many students, so much response to our plea for resources, such a pile of physical and architectural splendor, with growing prestige and its concomitant, we hope, of slow penetration of a secular milieu, still many of our men are unhappy. Some of this is good. Settling down does not behoove us. Or being too content.

In an Order like ours where, in a way, so much depends on so few, the few must shoulder a heavy burden. Every piece of equipment they use in the battle, the aims and the strategy, must be subjected now and then to severe and pragmatic scrutiny. The contingent is neither sacred nor sacrosanct. The exhortation to faith presupposes that intelligence is doing all it can to delineate and en flesh before "blind" allegiance is expected or exacted.

What are some of the problems our schools are faced with today as we confront the phenomenon of mounting success mingled with the voices of doubt lifted in so many quarters? Strangely the harder and harsher things are not being uttered by outsiders, who seem increasingly impressed with our continued vitality, the professional competence and the "legitimacy of both worlds" theme which we espouse, but from our own fellow Jesuits, fellow Catholics. Maybe we've succeeded in developing independent thought beyond our wildest expectations. What are the critics saying? General indictment or talk go only so far. We must be specific. Knowing a problem is half an answer. What then are the problems?

Problem 1. Commonweal and John Leo and the author of *Georgeham* in America and some scholastics and some theologians, who feel that the work of the kingdom is coextensive with formal theology, are not happy because we are not doing more. We should close down our schools, move on to the State and secular campuses, leave mundane wisdom to mundane thinkers and let religion alone be our particular dish. The cultic conception of the priesthood also emerges here. Theology alone matters. Yet in man's segmented and various life only so much time and energy can be realistically allotted to the spiritual. Paul Tillich says that every situation is a religious situation. This means that intention and sublimation should permeate all we do. Dichotomies are so often untruthful.

While I do not wish to caricature the situation, and it has about it a blunt and simple validity, yet closing our schools because we are not doing more (Aelred Graham remarked once that the best was the enemy of the good) or keeping them open for only sacral concerns is so idealistic as an operating premise, in my judgment, so wanting in circumspection that it should grieve the thoughtful. Old Chinese proverb say: He who wants too much gets nothing.

The teaching of graduate theology in some few prestigious secular universities, Princeton, Yale, Stanford, or the relative success of some Newman clubs on this or that campus, still leaves the normal undergraduate by the millions in the United States of America at a crucial and malleable stage in his thought and character life untouched and unshaped, and if anything, to consider religion, by implication at least, as a marginal and even esoteric concern.

I have never understood why if we cannot do everything we should do nothing. Maximizers so often undo a good cause by expectation far in excess of what any realist would hope for, or a given situation would warrant. The influence exercised by our universities, colleges and high schools, the spirit for good which they cultivate, the increasingly professional aptitudes in which they have tutored their charges, the healthy criticizing and openness which they have nourished, the loyalty they have elicited, the full spectrum of civil and religious discourse carried on under our aegis, the phenomenon of male piety, not too flourishing in most other parts of the Christian world, which our institutions, according to Father Andrew Greeley's findings, have fostered—

all these deserve respect and praise. To terminate this impact would seem unwise when the options have, at best, a questionable chance of success.

Problem 2. We should be doing something besides education. A young Vice Provincial mentioned one day during a committee gathering at the Congregation that the Society should be more *disponibilis*, less tied down, more ready and able to move in and out of situations as urgency or need would demand. The light cavalry which Loyola began didn't seem very light, nor did it move like the storybook says cavalries ought to move.

Here again there is a legitimacy in the charge; it is somewhat correct, somewhat faulty. But to feel seriously that in the American situation this kind of semi-romanticism should be put into operation is, in my view, naive. Amherst and Ohio State and Colorado are not simply counterparts of Boston College, St. Louis and San Francisco. Wilson High School and Roosevelt and Cleveland are not simply operations that parallel and reduplicate what is done by Jesuit High, Fordham Prep and Gonzaga. The sustained and vital insertion of values in an enervated age, the holding up of Christ to young students as admirable and adorable, the grooving of their love life when they begin to realize that everyone has to have a love, is a consummate challenge. That their moral and spiritual growth, their own acumen and maturity begin to occur at 15 and 21 under our aegis and with our influence, by doctrine and exemplarity, by our living witness as human beings charged with the vision and the call—these are high achievements. But our schools will have to be vigilant to avoid that which has laid Protestant schools low, the diminution of specificity, a benign corrosion by which old formulas have been rejected just because they are old and they are formulas.

Stanford and Whitman, William and Mary, Rutgers, Yale and Chicago all began as religious schools. But some years ago religion and traditional philosophy died the death, as far as having influence explicitly upon the outlook and commitment in the lives of the great majority of undergraduate students. Disaffiliation between learning and religion has been the order of the day for a long time in Protestant schools. I wonder why. They both serve the same Master.

Is there some inherent antagonism, I wonder, between the religious establishment we call the church and the educational establishment we call the school? It's understandable because

a commitment seems to preclude further critical inquiry, and on the other hand, just looking all the time can corrode conviction. So both camps could be legitimately anxious about their respective survival. In the advance of the other, each sees its own doom. And maybe this is God's fruitful tension built into the human situation, not meant to undo us, however, but to challenge us to a continuing redress between the two.

Problem 3. Closely related to the former two problems is a case of what is, I believe, Moral Idealism among some of our younger Jesuits. I do not indict all, or even most of the scholastics. The defect is judgmental. Frankly, their generosity, their willingness to adapt, and therefore a certain laudable freedom from inside them, puts them in many ways ahead of our generation. But the long periods of study, the years of being cloistered from the ongoing, the interminable lag before they have live contact with our colleges and high schools, the tension at times between the scholasticates and our schools which makes them mutually unsympathetic and even intolerant—they cannot be immune to these varied forces.

The eagerness which a catapaulting and exploding world incites in them, furthermore, and the lack of experience which tempers the intuition of lay people with families, as they come up daily against the bloody and jagged contour of the real, leaves a gap, a vacancy in the maturity cycle of some younger Jesuits.

Many students in our high schools and universities do not like required retreats, required classes, a required curriculum. Because in their own externally untroubled lives there may have been small crises they favor freedom, the thrust toward tomorrow, and forget order. With little thought of sensible and sane substitutes they urge that we cut back more and more severely on required philosophy or theology in the colleges, that we even abdicate jurisdiction over our institutions by constant plebiscite among the lay faculty and the students.

It seems to them that because things like retreats are *required*, they are bad. Yet the idea of a retreat, a confrontation between God and myself, an experience in self orientation between God and myself, is good and needed. All men are hungry for some answers, some assurances, some direction, some One.

I would say concerning retreats, for example, rejuvenate the structure, get top men, let the students talk more, show "Death of a Salesman" or "Hud." Let's put up money for retreat houses,

let's get manpower and the ingenuity into this that we put into, say, athletics or academe.

Our schools are not simply neutral chunks of geography, where a jousting and a trysting goes on. It's romantic to think that the normal undergraduate has the time or energy or ability to adequately probe or analyze all systems of thought and conviction. He doesn't. Exigency is the terminology of realism.

And as for required things—well, the world outside is sternly necessitarian. You are *required* to do the work assigned in industry, be on time, pay bills, follow under penalty civil and social laws. Exigency can be good. It can bring pressures to bear. Robert Kennedy once said, "my brother, the President, did not buckle under pressures. He welcomed them. They made him strong."

As Jacques Barzun points out in the *House of Intellect*, Romanticism as a recurring phenomenon has always had about it an absolutism. The answer to the past, and we are often undeserving heirs, is that where it has failed, we say, "destroy it." That was the Queen's solution to all problems in Alice in Wonderland—"off with her head," such a poorly thought out answer that neither the Mad Hatter nor Alice paid the slightest attention.

Problem 4. The Society's growth has not kept pace with the mounting demands. Marquette, Detroit, Loyola at Chicago, along with others are all rushing in size and complexity toward Clark Kerr's multi-versity. Laymen command more and more pivotal positions. As there are fewer of us, our influence, so the argument goes, wanes. Of course, the diminutive categories of 30 years ago are getting knocked about. And these huge operations have no small job in revindicating their deeply Christian validity in highly impersonal situations. But I wonder how the Ordinaries would view their suspension. We have already heard in clear and articulate terms how two of our most distinguished churchmen in America would feel about such a dread possibility. Cardinal Ritter and Cardinal Cushing confront in speculation their absence as sources of influential Christian thought, discourse, experimentation and witness, and figure it would be an unparalleled tragedy for the Church. Even Michael Novak of Stanford, the arch critic, feels the last thing which should be done is to close our schools.

Father Walsh of Boston College spoke a few years ago on what he called a radiation principle of influence. It's the old principle of *actio in distans*. You don't have to be every place all the time to have impact. Wisdom must be as ingenious as the idiom implies.

As for the laymen, I feel that both the colleges and the prep schools have been pre-eminent in their view of how the layman is *the* great co-instrument of the apostolate. Even in pre-Joannine days we Jesuits thought these thoughts and had sought the counsel and support of our lay allies as well as extended heavy responsibility to them. They share and co-share, weigh, help decide, speak when we might not be listened to. The naive conclusion that because we don't have more troops and can't do it all ourselves, we must turn our schools over to others is again so uncritical that it pains the judicious. I don't criticize the critics, therefore, for being critical; I chastize them for not being critical enough, not really judging the way things are and the lay of the future.

As a point in issue, Our schools *belong* to us. They are a family legacy. As in natural societies, continuity, spirit, a careful cultivation of tradition typify the things passed on from generation to generation,—Ford Motor Co., the New York Times, Giannini's banks, so likewise in a supernatural society such as ours. If the spirit or will fail us these schools will not have to be handed over, they will be forfeit. A bankruptcy in either desire or vision always has sanctions. In a competitive world you compete or you die.

Great movements are the shadows of great men. We should not be so naive as to think that the collectivity in any sustained form has been imaginative, resourceful, providential. Our schools are public, and for public good, and directed with much counseling and audience. But the responsibility and ultimate decision is ours. Not the grossest labor union in the country would suggest that Ford or duPont be handed over to the employees. You say we are not a business. Education always has been partially business.

As for vocations, the day of the layman is in full ascendancy and religious life, perforce, stands in some temporary eclipse. Victor Hugo once wrote that "not a whole army will withstand an idea if its time has come." The hour of the layman has come; it is long overdue. But with experience, just the experience I've run into with so many returning from the Peace Corps, many will see the longer view. For they return saying, "what I did made such little ultimate impact. In two years I alone counted for so little. The job of human reclamation (and that means redemption) is life long. Many in concert are needed. Divided loyalties, stopgap, here two years and then gone, will never be enough."

So commitment, long corporate action, the concern and training and zeal of generations brought to focus will find little substitute in even a most intense and commendable humanitarianism. Religious life in numbers, influence, new vitality and imagination, will undergo and is right now undergoing a powerful renaissance. I predict more numbers will respond and reenlist in the cause in the years ahead.

Problem 5. The Order today has not yet managed to demonstrate effectively its creativity before the new problems which now abound. I submit here a sad assent. The differences which we feel should distinguish our graduates at all levels, prep, college, and university, in their thought life, their value scales, their sensitivity and aesthetic responses, their social radar,—the differences leave much to be desired.

Robert Hutchins questions in a much noised abroad speech whether at the alumni gathering of one of our schools and one of our secular counterparts there is much discernible difference in the conduct of the two. Of course grace, an inner life, union with God, humility before an absolute, loyalty in the clinch—these are not qualities easily fingered in the raucous din. But I feel that excessive structure, centralization of initiative, age and size have undone some of the vision, the magnetism that made for such superlativity in the days of yore when young men put on the novice's cassock, left royal houses and university chairs because of the fire enkindled. "Romanita" or centralism has not only inflicted damage on the Church, it has unduly tied the whole Society down to patterns that are an anachronism. Some structured renovation is imperative.

So the stark challenge confronts us on an unprecedented scale, of what to do about so much that is so available, so constantly. We cannot build up walls against the world. It's the only one we have. Nor the times.

True, our charges, and even we, are surfeited often with abundance, an ambivalence everywhere, a culture promising much and delivering little. Technology has, furthermore, conditioned those whom we teach to top entertainment, technique, oceans of erudition, now quickly programmed and made instantaneously available. So, strangely enough, young people, for all their exposure to the shoddy, have in my judgment low tolerance for the same from us. And they do honor to us in what they desire and expect from their mentors.

Many college theology courses today are severely indicted. Philosophy, which some years ago had admittedly fallen here and there into formula and stereotype, the antithesis of live inquiry, still now is being minimized in its *basic* importance, reduced to credits and hours, restricted to often excessively historical stress. Modeling themselves on the most non-committed of men, deprived apparently of a basic metaphysics, a sense of unity in a world fractured everywhere, some of these new moderns, even in our own schools, foster the cult of equivalence in values, a logical hyper-relativism in morals, abdication of judgment before competing views. They don't seem to see the need to rationally explain a stand, if one is ever to be made, whether it be in Saigon or Selma.

Problem 6. Our inability to comprehend an erupting world, where old answers in many ways really are that, has led us not into innovationism in any spectacular way, but into a mimic of the tone and structure of anti-hero, anti-authority, anti-order. When the epitome of enormous success with men in sports, art, literature, government and even war has been the man or woman who embodied a reconciliation of the old and new, brilliant and splendid techniques, talking in new and exciting idiom about what's important, so many of Ours often forget this value and enhance some passing novelty. We can be dupes for the present rage.

So we have much work to do in the ontology of leadership. Democratic institutions have not lessened our need and passion for the visionary, the brave and the strong. John Kennedy's following is legion because he in our times demanded the long view, sacrifice, faith. He talked the language of the young. With discrimination and wit, a touch of pathos and then laughter, his fondness for life, the ocean spray, a ball game, his family, and as his friend Richard Cardinal Cushing wrote, down on his knees nightly, suppliant before his mysterious and kindly Lord,—this man in these days of anti-hero has been immortalized, not just because he died, but because he lived, and loved and led.

The problems which confront us are heavy and interlocked. Fifty years from now men will be clamoring again, or still, for contemporary solutions. Each generation works out its own destiny. But the school is the peculiar seedbed of ideas and ideals. Even history's rogues have seen that the crucible and measure of tomorrow's world is education. No process is more germane to the growth of a man's insides, how he sees, what he sees, how he loves, what he loves. The school has about it the dispassion which

other societies cannot boast of. The state must deal daily with much clamor, self interest, partisanship and power, acceded to or beaten down. The same is true for economics, for business and labor,—immense self interest and conflict abound.

But the school, even the school with no great supernatural mission to re-enforce, tutors innocence, purifies motives, makes freedom viable because clear and intelligent choices are available. To engage in such noble cause is a high kind of self completion. Other than in the emerging world of communication, radio, television and cinema—and these are kinds of education—I can envision no field of work whose aims are more contiguous with general human selfhood and felicity than the school. Each of us finds some spot in its variety where even he can help. It keeps the old young, the sure filled with healthy and normal doubt, the inquirers tethered to a few fundamentals, it chastizes daily the arrogant.

Our schools stretching from Phoenix to Syracuse and from Tampa to Tacoma are like sacraments, signs of benediction, the long results of forebears who planted where we at this moment harvest. In these days ahead we must do the same planting for those after us.

The Role of the Layman in the Jesuit Apostolate of Education

CHARLES J. DONAHUE

You have conferred a great honor upon me in asking me to address the representatives of a society with so distinguished a tradition in the theory and practice of Christian education. That honor is heightened by the fact that I am speaking at a time when Jesuit higher education is clearly at the beginning of a new era. The Second Vatican Council has created new demands and new opportunities for Catholic higher education. You are faced with the delicate task of adapting your education to meet these demands at a time when all higher education in the United States is caught in the storms attending rapid expansion and efforts to meet the needs of new kinds of students.

Last fall, at a time when I was occasionally recalling that I had now completed my third decade at Fordham—a full generation—I was jolted out of my concerns in the sixth century by your invitation to address you on my present topic which includes such questions as: “Does a Jesuit education truly serve the Church today? Is it relevant? Is there a dichotomy of laicus-clericus on the Jesuit campus?” During my years as a member of the lay component of the faculty of a Jesuit university I had come to very firm convictions as to the value to the Church of Jesuit education. I accepted the invitation intending to come here and to bear witness to the values I had discovered in my years at Fordham.

At first it seemed a fairly simple task, but after being drawn into a vortex of lively discussion at Fordham during the past few months about our character as an American Catholic University, I drew up a second and finally a third draft of this address, insisting that it is an interim report but feeling that it contains more than the opinions of an individual. The material is colored by my personal views and incorporates personal experience but it also incorporates, I now feel, some central convictions of the Fordham Academic Community, the lay component and the Jesuit component.

Implicit in the Fordham discussions there seemed to be an agreed view of the purpose and relevance of a Catholic university

here and now in the United States and, as a corollary, of the place of the layman in such a university. This view can be put in four propositions: (1) Human knowledge is open, involving constant search and constant re-appraisal. In so far as it is human knowledge, theology is subject to the conditions of human knowledge. (2) At the heart of the intellectual life of the Church is a dialogue between a developing theology and the dynamic secular sciences. (This view is Newman's.) (3) The Catholic university is an institution for conducting this dialogue. It is a place where the Catholic Body can do its thinking. (4) Since the Catholic Body consists of clergy and laity, it is desirable that both clergy and laity be represented on the faculty.

To these four propositions I have contributed nothing but the arrangement and some of the wording. They represent a consensus to which many (not all) of my more concerned colleagues would subscribe. It will be noted that from a view of human knowledge in its relation to theology is derived a theory of the Catholic university and its relevance to the life of the Church as a whole. The question of the place of the layman is related to the purpose of the Catholic university. He is a necessary part of the faculty. He is not there simply because priests are in short supply. He is there to represent the lay point of view. Both are necessary if the faculty community is to be an *ecclesiola*, representative of the whole Church. Both are interested in, and may have different lights upon, the dialogue that is at the core of Catholic intellectual life.

The propositions, then, contain an answer, one firmly based in the structure of the Church and the purpose of the Catholic university, to the question implied in my title, "What is the place of the layman in the Jesuit educational apostolate?" But this is an answer on a purely theoretical level. I shall try to give it greater depth and particularity by commenting, in the light of my experience, on three topics which I believe are central to your concerns here and upon which the propositions and the general answer I have already suggested to the question of the place of the layman bear. The topics are (1) the academic community and the laicus-clericus dichotomy; (2) the service of the Catholic graduate school to the Church in America during the past generation; and (3) the prospects for Jesuit liberal arts education in the coming generation. I hope the connection of these topics and their relevance to my central theme will become clearer in the course of my remarks.

The laicus-clericus arrangements I am familiar with are, I suppose, the usual ones on liberal arts faculties in Jesuit universities. Jesuit fathers are dispersed as worker priests throughout all departments. Every department, even theology, has at least some lay representatives. Chairmanships are shared equally and more or less at random. At Fordham this system works well. I have never been aware, and neither have any lay colleagues I have talked to, of a laicus-clericus dichotomy at Fordham. Good faculties educate one another. I am deeply indebted to the ecclesiastical learning of my Jesuit colleagues. It has been constantly at my disposal, and I have used it in classes, in professional publications, and in my personal meditations on the meaning of my own life and work. Good faculties are controversial, and many questions have divided us. In most of our controversies there has been at least one layman and one Jesuit on each of the ten sides. (A faculty that cannot think up at least ten sides to any question is not worth its salt.)

The Fordham faculty is protected in its tenure by contract and guaranteed academic freedom according to the rules of the AAUP. We have, I believe, the largest AAUP membership of any Catholic university. Many of us regard these arrangements as useful principally to assure a public, still suspicious of the possibility of freedom in a Catholic university, that all is well with us. Actually the laicus-clericus relationship has developed so firm a sense of community that we don't know by experience whether our legal apparatus is good or not. It has never been put to a test.

By a community I mean an aggregate of persons held together by shared concerns and shared loves rather than by the possibility of legal coercion or a cash nexus. Any academic community is bound by a shared concern for free intellectual quest. There may be other bonds as well. A Catholic university has an additional shared concern for the relationship of the intellectual quest in the secular sciences to man's apprehension of religious truth.

In my experience, deans, academic and executive vice-presidents, and presidents, in short, all administrators directly concerned with the teaching staff or strictly academic matters, have always been Jesuit priests. A happy result has been that our leaders have been integral parts of the academic community. As Jesuits, the administrators have all had experience as teachers and scholars. Many of them have been distinguished scholars. As Jesuits, they have all experienced a liberal education identical with that of the

Jesuit component of the teaching staff and similar to that of the lay component. As Jesuits, they have all been intimately concerned with that dialogue between theology and the separate sciences which has been a central and underlying concern of the faculty community. As members of the academic community, they have been in a position to co-ordinate and direct the affairs of that community from within—tactfully, creatively, and in such a way that the life of the community has gone on without harsh and alien intrusion.

Community between teaching staff and administration is of great advantage to a university because the life of the faculty community is the life of the university. Administrators pass, professors pass, but the community abides, assuring continuance of its concerns, developing to meet change, accumulating experience. You know all these things, because you are members of a religious community, and a religious community is a close analogue of an academic community. Historically the two are intimately connected.

Now, the average American, reared in a society stamped by the institutions of contemporary capitalism, does not regard the university as a community—something like his family or his church or synagogue. He sees it rather as a large service enterprise, a kind of combination of factory and supermarket, where his son can buy his education, attractively packaged in things called courses. The average American is a simple man. His son, if he gets a liberal education, will know better. The American educator is beginning to split into two distinct breeds, a breed of scholars and a breed of administrators. The two breeds are beginning to have less and less in common in background, experience, and shared values. The bifurcation I refer to is perhaps most apparent in such mammoth enterprises as State universities. I suspect that the distinction between breeds will become sharper until administration and teaching staff are no longer members of a single community. They will be united only by contract and cash nexus like the bosses and workers in an industrial enterprise. When that happens, higher education will have become what the average American thinks it is already.

There are responsible educators who are not particularly alarmed by the prospect of conducting higher education on the analogy of industrial enterprise. We do not have time to discuss the point. Having posed the problem, I assume that most of you agree

with me that, at least on the college level where young adults are concerned, a good liberal education is likely to occur only where the student can participate, as a junior member, in an academic community. The value of that education is determined partly by the student's own activity and partly by the quality of the community. Since, in our present society, so many forces work against the sense for community, independent universities that have achieved it can surely best serve the national common good by cultivating it as a precious heritage which, if lost, would be irreplaceable.

Where a firm community spirit exists in a Jesuit university, there is no objection, of course, to opening executive posts to laymen, particularly to those who have shared for some time the life of the faculty community. But when I read in responsible journals articles by laymen suggesting that total laicization both of the corporation and administration is the solution of Catholic educational problems, I smile with incredulity. At least in the case of Fordham, I feel that such a *bouleversement* would imperil the sense of community built up, as such things are, by lifelong efforts of intelligent tactfulness and now constituting one of our greatest assets as we face the coming stormy age in American higher education. A continued Jesuit presence in all departments and in at least many executive posts is, I believe, necessary to safeguard and develop our present sense of community.

During the past generation, I believe, the Fordham Graduate School has demonstrated the value of a sense of community by its contribution to the solution of some of the intellectual problems of the Catholic Body in the United States. And here we come to our second topic, reminding ourselves that a purpose of the Catholic university is to provide a place where Catholics can do their thinking.

Public criticism of the cultural level of the Catholic Body in the United States has now become a favorite sport among the young. The Catholic Body is ghetto-ized, we are told, out of touch with the best that is being thought and said in the world, and particularly with the best in American liberal thinking. Doubtless there are many areas where substantiation of these charges could be easily found. The trouble with the young, however, is that they are not old. They do not possess a long view backward and cannot compare the present state of the Catholic Body with its state thirty years ago. Some day, I hope, a Catholic

graduate school will turn out a carefully documented study of the thinking and sensibility of the American Catholic Body during the decade, let us say, 1925-1935. The writer of the study might well conclude that the Catholic Body, cut off by the death of the immigrant clergy from its continental and Irish roots and still not comprehending its American environment, reached in that decade a cultural nadir. The book has not been written, however, and I am obliged to depend upon my own recollection of conditions in southern New England and the Atlantic seaboard. There were, needless to say, some bright spots and very numerous patches of light, but there was a threat of alienation in the intellectual atmosphere. Secular universities at that time were more dogmatically secularist than they are today. The reaction of many of the Catholic Body was an almost paranoid fear of academe, particularly of the new behavioral sciences, sociology and psychology, and their exponents. Catholic colleges were viewed not as centers of light which could bring understanding of the new environment but rather as bastions against the secularist and Protestant enemy. "Courageous attacking" of doctrines believed to be dangerous to faith or morals was a favorite form of Catholic action. As I look back on the scene, I incline to the opinion that there was a real danger that the Catholic Body might have rejected contemporary American intellectual life and followed the fundamentalist Protestants into a radical anti-intellectualism.

The Jesuit cadre at Fordham who received the new faculty members when the Graduate School was re-organized in the mid-thirties were very conscious of the danger of intellectual alienation threatening the Catholic Body at the time. Both they and some of the younger laymen arriving from places like St. Michael's were in private very outspoken. (This was my first experience of a Catholic University, and I was beginning to learn about the possibilities of Catholic self-criticism.) Yet we had no plans for public proclamations about the inadequacies of our fellow-Catholics. We hoped to remedy inadequacies and calm unnecessary fears by bringing all the secular arts and sciences into the renovated graduate school; by practicing them there freely according to their own light and laws of evidence in active cooperation, through learned societies and the like, with practitioners in other universities, state and independent, secular and religious.

Here, in a Catholic university, we were free to indicate, when the material warranted it, points of particular interest or value to a Catholic, or points where insight of a Catholic kind, as in literature or intellectual history, might throw light on the material. Apparent contradictions between the material and doctrinal formulations were to be faced calmly, without any suggestion of an obscurantist anxiety to plaster them over with a "ready answer." We felt, and still feel, that the power to live with such tensions in the calm confidence that eventually they will be creatively solved to the enrichment of Catholic tradition is a necessary part of the faith of an intellectual. Historical support for that confidence, always available, is now accumulating rapidly. One thinks of the use in Catholic Biblical criticism of philological methods once regarded as dangerous. Or one need only speak the name of Père Teilhard.

Problems remain. In the American Catholic Body there is still a disappointingly large rear guard very far to the rear of Vatican II and in the ghetto condition characteristic of 1935, and that fact makes it possible for the youthful critics we mentioned some time ago to go on with their charges of ghetto-ization. They seldom make it clear that their attacks apply now only to a portion of the Catholic Body. They are quite unaware of the improvement during the past generation and of the part played in that improvement by Catholic higher education. Scolding a rear guard, in any case, seems a rather pointless use of intellectual energy at a time when Catholics are confronted on all sides by the positive challenges of the *aggiornamento*. Surely those of us who are concerned with the development of a meaningful program of Catholic higher education for the future would perhaps be well advised to follow the tactic of the last generation, to avoid public attacks and to go on to deploy our not inconsiderable educational resources to meet the needs of the foreseeable future. We can do so now with added confidence since the most recent addition to those resources, the graduate school, has been proved of much value in meeting the needs of the Church in the United States during the past generation.

Now that America has been explained to the Church, an important future problem for the Catholic graduate school may be to explain the Church to America. It helps to do that when it carries out well its normal functions of research and the preparation of experts in the arts and sciences. But more specific tasks

are imposed by the present situation. One relevant fact in that situation is that a larger proportion of American higher education in the future will be conducted in State universities. Independent and Church-related higher education will become peripheral. A second relevant fact is this: partly as a result of the pluralistic atmosphere of the last few years, many concerned teachers in State colleges feel that, while State education must maintain a strict neutrality, it will warp its program if it closes its courses to teaching about religion as an important fact of human culture. In addition, some State universities give credit for courses in the theology of various faiths of the Judeo-Christian tradition. To provide scholars capable of teaching about religion as an important cultural fact or of staffing what State university theology courses are now being offered is clearly one service which the church-connected graduate school is especially equipped to offer to the national educational effort. With a view to such needs, Fordham is strengthening its graduate theology department and that department is acquiring a marked ecumenical tone by working in co-operation with the Union Theological Seminary. In addition, doctoral programs are being offered combining work in theology with literary studies, history, or the behavioral sciences—in short, those fields where religion is likely to be relevant as an important cultural force.

In the mission of explaining the Church to America, however, Jesuit education is by no means dependent on the graduate schools alone. The older Jesuit institutions, the colleges and secondary schools, are still very much present and, in my opinion, developing in a way that gives promise for further effectiveness. Under the influence of the graduate schools, new approaches are being worked out to the problems of an education at once liberal and religious for young adults in America today. And here I approach our third and last topic.

For about a decade now, experiment has been going on. To meet the challenge of dynamically pursued secular disciplines, the teaching of both philosophy and theology in the college has been given a more dynamic character. Philosophy courses, while still centered in the perennial philosophy, are conducted in a spirit of emphatic awareness of what is going on in philosophical circles throughout the world. (The international character of the Society is an aid here.) Theology now means an introduction to responsible professional thinking about religion, particularly

but not exclusively about Catholic Christianity. In Fordham College, we are, I believe, working towards the development of a new kind of religiously oriented liberal education. For any young adult, liberal education means the opportunity to discover the style and convictions of his maturity during years spent as a junior member of a community engaged in the active development of knowledge. Catholic liberal education differs from secular liberal education not by excluding anything or restricting the free activity of any discipline but by including the dynamism of the Catholic tradition in itself and in its relation to other knowledge among its offerings. Thus it holds open to the committed Catholic wider choices as he confronts the intellectual problems of a Christian maturity.

The program we are developing has particular appeal for the gifted student and makes demands to which only the able can fully respond. It makes rather special demands on the faculty, too. A proportionately fairly large Jesuit presence is probably necessary for the success of the program. There must also be a considerable number of lay professors actively interested in the religious implications of their material. Jesuit priests are in short supply, and the requisite Catholic lay scholars are not too easy to find either. There are definite limits to the possibilities for expanding the program. My own feeling is that the program should be consciously developed as a program for the able, and that, as pressures for admission to the liberal arts program in Jesuit colleges rise, the intellectual standards for admission be raised so that education of an increasingly able group can be carried on by a faculty seriously interested in the religious element in the program. This will be Jesuit liberal education in the strict sense of the word, and it will be turning out an elite lay leadership. In our egalitarian society, "elite" is an odious word. Here, however, we are not concerned with an elite of social or economic privilege but an elite of the intellect marked particularly by an intelligent and compassionate social understanding—the hallmark of *aggiornamento* Catholicism. Such an elite is not odious.

I agree with the widely held opinion that Catholic higher education cannot expand to keep pace with the planned expansion in state education. This means that an increasing proportion of Catholics will be educated in public colleges. A great expansion of institutions such as Newman Clubs is indubitably going to be necessary to meet the spiritual needs of these Catholics. I

suggest, however, that the long-range solution of the problem would not be furthered if the Society abandoned its own colleges in order to move a considerable number of priests into state education. It may well prove sounder policy to maintain Jesuit higher education and conduct it with a view to the needs of state education and particularly with a view to the needs of Catholics involved in state education. Many of the new lay elite versed in the Catholicism of the *aggiornamento* now beginning to emerge from what I have called hard-core Jesuit liberal arts colleges, are choosing the academic life and may very well find careers in state education. In general, the prospects for the Jesuit apostolate of education seem brighter today than they did a generation ago partially because the Catholic Body today is more open than it was a generation ago to the values of the intellectual life. That they are more open today is due in no small measure to the success of the Jesuit apostolate during the past generation.

Time remains only for a brief last word and that must be a personal one. It is unlikely that I shall ever have the opportunity to speak again to so large and eminent a Jesuit audience. If behind the words I have spoken here there has not occasionally shone forth some of the joy I have felt in my work at Fordham, I have failed to express myself. I shall say it now, *en clair*, as best I can. From out of the day-to-day activity of scrutinizing facts, testing hypotheses, and discussing present and changing states of questions with colleagues and students, something, I believe, is occasionally distilled which goes beyond fact, hypothesis, or state of the question, although it is not independent of these nor to be had without them. This distillation I shall call wisdom. It brings to studies a new level of meaning and interest and, on a very high plane, a kind of utility. I do feel that out of the scholarly action of the community at Fordham during the past generation some wisdom was distilled and that the wisdom proved of value to the Church and to the national culture. Had I been associated with another university I would still, I suspect, have been a reasonably happy and moderately successful philologist, possibly on a strictly professional level a more productive one than I have been at Fordham. But I might not have learned by experience of that new level of significance that comes to studies through a sense of mission which transcends the scholarly process without distorting it. That source of joy I feel I owe to the Fordham community and particularly to its Jesuit component.

I have had the privilege of participating with you in a decisive move forward in the intellectual life of the Church. That is no small privilege. When in the light of my own experience with you, I look back on the history of your Society, I note that many times during the past four centuries when occasion came for finding a new mode of wisdom by intellectual penetration of the exigencies of new times and new places, the Society has served the Church well. I am thinking of Trent as well as of Vatican II, of your missions in the Far East as well as your sense for the intellectual needs of the Catholic Body in the United States during the last generation. Your efforts have sometimes been met, even in Catholic circles, with ingratitude. That fact is probably not very important. I am sure that it is not a desire for human gratitude that motivates you. But since I am here and you are in front of me, I should like to say, quite simply, for our experience together and all that it has meant to me, thank you.

The Problems of Jesuit Education In the United States

ANDREW M. GREELEY

When I was asked to prepare this paper I was given stern instructions that I was to tell the truth, all of the truth, even if it hurt. I'm not really sure who the truth was supposed to hurt, whether it would be me or Jesuit higher education. But, in any case, I propose in this paper to take my instructions seriously. In doing so, I of course will follow the advice of the ancient Irish political adage, "Tell the truth—of course tell the truth—tell a whole lot of truth and tell more truth than anybody expects you to tell, but never tell the whole truth."

I shall contend in this paper that the problems of Jesuit higher education in the United States are essentially American problems, problems which are typical, to a considerable extent, of most American higher educational institutions and which are to be expected in a religious order as it adjusts to the American environment. I will further argue that just as the problems Jesuit higher education faces in the United States are essentially American, so the strength that it possesses is also essentially American strength. I will further contend that the solutions to present problems must be American solutions. I propose to suggest that the paths down which Jesuit higher education must move require of Jesuit educators the courage to see that applying American solutions to American problems is in the finest traditions of the Society. I will argue that adaptation to the American environment requires the same vision, the same understanding, and the same courage that the great Matteo Ricci displayed when he gave convincing evidence that one could be Catholic and Jesuit and still be Chinese. I will further maintain that those who argue that you cannot be American in the fullest sense of the word and still be loyal to the tradition of St. Ignatius are as much in error as those timid and unwise little men who destroyed the noble work that Ricci had built.

Let me stress two things at the beginning of this paper. First of all, I speak to you as an outsider. I am not now, never have been, and presumably never will be a member of the Society. For all my familiarity with the Society and its members, I could

not be expected to understand what goes on inside the Society or the subtle aspects of the Jesuit tradition. Hence, if there seem to be times when I do not see the point of your problems, then it must be attributed, at least in part, to the fact that I do speak from the outside; but if I am an outsider let me also stress the fact that I am a friendly and respectful outsider. I stand in awe of the tremendous institutional strength the American Jesuits have displayed. To some considerable extent, when one speaks of American Catholic higher education one is speaking of Jesuit higher education and, until very recently, when one was speaking of American Catholic scholarship, one was necessarily speaking of scholarship which was almost entirely Jesuit. While I shall level criticisms in the course of my talk today, let me emphasize that these criticisms are spoken within the context of profound respect.

The second point I would make by way of introductory caution is that I presume that I was not called here today to speak words of praise. If this had been my assignment I easily could have filled up twenty-five pages of manuscript just with praise. But I would gather that my assignment is so critical, to point out the problems that must be faced, while presuming that everybody realizes that I am conscious of the great successes that have been achieved. If, therefore, my paper does not mention, save in passing, great accomplishments, it is only because I understand that such is not my assignment today. Some of the criticisms which I will speak will be very blunt criticisms, but I must tell you that every single one of them I have heard spoken from the mouth of a member of your community. In a sense, what I am doing this morning is gathering together the criticisms of Jesuits about Jesuit higher education and from the lofty, if somewhat secure, position of an outsider presenting them back to you. Obviously, not all the criticisms that I will make are true of all Jesuit colleges and universities. They are, rather, aimed at tendencies which are to be found to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the particular tendency under consideration, in the Jesuit higher educational enterprise. Virtually all of these tendencies are, I think, in retreat; the process of change is going on at a rapid rate and I presume that whether I mention them or not, many of these objects of criticism will have vanished from the scene before five more years have passed. However, listing them this morning may at least accelerate their departure. I further

presume that most of them will not be news to any of the men gathered here, but still some function is to be served by speaking out loudly and clearly.

My paper will be divided into three general sections. In the first section I shall speak in general of the phenomenon of American Catholicism within which Jesuit higher education is operating. In the second section I shall speak at some length of the specific problems of Jesuit higher education. In the third section I shall suggest some paths toward the solution of these problems.

I propose to say four things about the present state of the American Church. First of all, we are involved in a crucial transition as the Catholic population becomes more and more an integral part of American life, a transition that was ritually symbolized when the Douay Bible appeared on the rostrum of the Capitol Building on that cold winter day of January, 1961. We are no longer a nation of immigrants. Even though 10 per cent of our population is, indeed, foreign born and 40 per cent more of the Catholic population are the children of foreign born parents, the immigrant phenomenon in American Catholicism is rapidly coming to an end. We are leaving behind the ethnic ghettos of the old inner city and moving to the suburbs. We are no longer particularly threatened by a hostile American environment. Even though ethnic traditions persist, we no longer need to cling to our religion as a matter of ethnic loyalty. We are beginning to be at home in American society and the secure, simple verities of the ethnic ghetto no longer serve us very well. On the contrary, we have become quite relaxed in the face of the values of the larger American society. We are ready to make most of them our own. We are becoming increasingly responsive to the notion that what is good in higher education in general is also good for Catholic higher education. Although there is at least some evidence that we have on occasion succumbed to the temptations of the fads and the fashions and overlooked the implications of the real values, the day has long since passed when we can argue that simply because a college is a Catholic college it has to be a good college, just as the day has long since passed that one can say the only letters a man need write after his name to teach at this particular university are the letters S.J. Like it or not, our people are coming to expect of us the same standards of excellence that are expected by other Americans of their colleges and universities. Indeed, it seems that at least some

of them will expect of us higher standards than can be found in most American colleges and universities. They will not be content if we argue, as we probably validly can, that our colleges are now no worse than any other colleges, because they expect ours to be better. It seems to me that in the long run they are entitled to such an expectation.

But there is a second transition, a transition from the post-Reformation in American Catholicism to the Church of the ecumenical age. The Vatican Council began a revolutionary era in the Catholic Church. By "revolutionary" I do not mean an era when the past is completely overthrown. I mean an era of rapid development where it becomes quite possible that if the development is not up to the expectations of our people, we are faced with potentially revolutionary situations. Hence, our era is inevitably an era of restlessness, of anxiety, of great hopes, and great possibility for frustration and disappointment. We may wish that we were back among the serenities of the past, but the winds of change are blowing through the Church and they are blowing sometimes with almost hurricane force. Whether the presence of these winds is a good or bad thing I suppose depends on your point of view, but it would be the sheerest folly to pretend that the winds aren't really there.

The combination of the transitions from slum to suburb, and from the Tridentine Church to the Vatican Church has produced a very volatile situation in American Catholicism. It is my belief that the crises we are experiencing are crises of growth and not of decline. And I further believe that the real problems we face come not so much from the restlessness and great hope of our rank and file, but from the danger that some of those of us who are leaders will lose their nerve, their courage, and their faith, that they will argue that things must be slowed down, the lid must be put back on because the pace of growth is too rapid. If this should happen, then I think we may well experience some very serious disasters.

The third point I would mention is that the United States is a religious nation; indeed, it is a deeply religious nation. Despite the evidence of some recent court decisions there is no convincing data available that shows there is any long-run decline in importance of religion in American society. The fact that we do not have an established church and that our government is at best religiously neutral should not obscure the fact that America may

be among the most religious nations in the world, and surely the most religious of any of the large industrial nations of the North Atlantic community. We indeed have our secular humanism, a humanism which is generally agnostic rather than atheistic and we may even concede that while this humanism is small in numbers it has an important role in our society. But it is not a militant secularism, for the most part. It is not, again for the most part, interested in eliminating religion from the American scene. It is not even especially interested in making converts. The secular humanism insofar as it exists, let us say on the campus of the secular universities, is more eager to be friendly to American Catholicism than are some of the Protestant religions of our country. While some of the secular humanists are unquestionably our enemies, it is my impression that the vast majority of them would be only too happy to be our friends and would enjoy nothing more than engaging in a dialogue with us by which they would come to understand where we stand and why we take the stand we do. The United States is a profoundly ecumenic country and it is becoming even more ecumenic as the years go on. And I would further contend that this ecumenism is not an ecumenism of religious indifferentism although there is some of that in our society. The Protestant, the Jewish, and the humanist traditions are very eager to talk to American Catholicism. In fact, from one point of view, we might say they are too eager to talk to us because suddenly we have discovered this demand for dialogue only to find we do not have at our disposal the scholarly resources which would enable us to enter the dialogue with the confidence we would like to have.

There is a paradox in saying that America is a religious nation when many of our institutions are formally neutral. But I think it would be a grave mistake if our European confreres would content themselves merely with repeating what their textbooks have to say about the United States, that it is a Protestant or a secularist nation. It is neither of these things. It is a religious nation in which three, and possibly four, religious "conspiracies" (to use John Courtney Murray's word) have been engaged in a dialogue for many years in which they compete with each other for attention and converse with each other for understanding while at the same time enforcing together generally assumed rules of the game which prevent any one "conspiracy" from overwhelming the other three. It is to be profoundly regretted that American Catholic

scholarship has not attempted to understand this paradox of a nation simultaneously secular and religious and it is to be hoped in years to come our social historical researchers will turn their attention to this phenomenon.

The fourth point to be made about American Catholicism is that it exists in a nation where laity have always taken their role in the Church seriously. This has surely been true, of course, of the Protestant and Jewish denominations. There were tendencies in early American Catholicism for it to be true of us, too, but the unfortunate after-effects (and I think misunderstandings) of the trusteeship phenomenon have until very recently kept the Catholic laity in the rather subservient position within the Church. Insights of lay participation which we could have learned from the rest of American society were not learned and were not conveyed to the rest of the Church. However, the past is the past, the American Catholic layman, especially of the younger variety, is beginning to be firmly persuaded that it is his Church just as much as anyone else's and his voice is going to be heard in the governance of the Church. The day is past when we who are clergy can say, "it's our Church and we will run it the way we want it" or "this is our school and if you don't like the way our school is run, you can go elsewhere". The laity, whose money, hard work, sacrifice, and dedication have helped us to build our schools, have helped you Jesuits to build your schools, are quite likely to consider that the schools belong to no one in particular and belong to everybody who has worked for them, and that they are their schools as much as they are your schools. They are, be they students, parents, faculty or lay administrators, going to demand with increasing vehemence that their voice be heard in the administration of schools which they, quite rightly, consider to be the common property of all American Catholics.

This, then, is the state of American Catholicism at the present. We live in a profoundly religious nation, a nation where the layman has always made his voice heard in what goes on in his Church, and where now Catholic laity are increasingly demanding that their voices be heard. We are caught in the midst of two transitions: from slum to suburb, and from counter-Reformation to ecumenism. We are, therefore, in the midst of a very fluid, uncertain era, an era when great growth is possible but when great problems and crises can arise.

I turn now to the second part of my talk, to the particular

problems of Jesuit higher education. I shall list four major problems and then a host of smaller problems. First of all, I have the impression that the growth of Jesuit higher education is, or until very recently has been, a rather unplanned and chaotic growth, that colleges and universities have sprung up around the country with only the very vaguest semblance of a master plan to justify their existence. Indeed, anyone who has read the histories of some of the Jesuit universities, is likely to be quite astonished at the almost casual way law schools, medical schools, schools of speech, of journalism, and of music have been picked up and patched together to convert suddenly a small liberal arts college into a university. Further, these professionally oriented universities or small liberal arts schools expanded in the era after the second world war almost overnight into immense higher educational institutions, again without too much of a clear idea of the particular direction the growth ought to take. There can be no doubt that this pell-mell, helter-skelter expansionism is a thoroughly American phenomenon. Neither can there be much doubt that on balance it has been a relatively good thing. If any attempt had been made to plan or control the growth of Catholic higher education in its pioneer years, it is to be feared that the schools would not have progressed nearly as far as they have. In the pioneer stage of the game, a vast amount of independence and permissiveness was probably a good idea. While growth must continue it seems to me that at the present time it is safe to argue that the pioneer stage is over and that now we are at a time for consolidation and for planned growth for more serious reasons in excellence. We are now at a time when we must evolve a more coherent philosophy of what we are trying to attempt with our colleges and universities and in what direction we are trying to move with them. There have been attempts to develop a rationale for Catholic higher education or for Jesuit higher education but it must be admitted that oftentimes these statements of goals are merely a repetition of pious cliches and have nothing to do either with what a university can be expected to accomplish or, in fact, is even trying to accomplish at the present time.

Jesuit higher education at the present time is in desperate need of a new comprehensive rationale for its existence and I am further saying that none of those presented thus far seem to me to be particularly convincing. I am not at all persuaded that statements about moral development of the whole man have much

to do with what we can legitimately expect of higher education. Colleges and universities can claim to be the places where the Church does its thinking, the places where certain theological and ecclesiastical positions are handed down, the places where an attempt is made to present an integrated view of the world, and places where a community of Christians can come together in some sort of free and open religious life. Beyond these goals, and beyond the statement that all must be achieved with as much style and class as possible, I am not sure that there is anything specifically different about Jesuit or about Catholic higher education. I may well be wrong, but in any event, now is surely the time when a philosophy and a master plan of American Catholic higher education is absolutely essential. We cannot continue with this fantastic multiplication of colleges without having some justification for what we are doing and for the way we are expanding.

The second problem of Jesuit higher education is again an intensely American problem. Jesuit schools, like all Catholic schools, and like most American schools until recently, have been quite unscholarly in their origins and goals. American higher education in its beginnings was essentially pragmatic, and concerned with developing skills and preparing people for vocations. Research, scholarship, academic values were practically invisible in the American universities until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and academic freedom surely did not become understood and respected until the late 1920's. Just as the Catholic schools and the Jesuit schools lagged in general behind the other American universities in their foundation, so we are lagging behind them in developing authentic scholarly concerns. The reasons for this have, by the way, nothing to do with the nature of Catholic belief or ecclesiastical organization but rather follow from the simple fact that the Catholic population came to this country somewhat later in the game than did the Protestant population. But we are now beginning to catch up on this lag in scholarship. And yet the truth of the matter is that there is only a beginning of scholarship on Catholic college and university campuses. No one would deny that the Jesuits have shown the lead in scholarship in the past but neither would anyone in his right mind believe that the scholarly standards of the past are adequate for us today. To argue that a given school is not a research school but a teaching school is merely a somewhat less than honest way of saying that we do not have a faculty that is

good enough to do research. There is no evidence—absolutely none—that a non-research faculty does any better job of teaching than a research faculty. There is only evidence that a non-research faculty is cheaper. We have made all kinds of pious affirmations about the values of research but I do not think that Jesuit colleges, or indeed any American Catholic colleges, have effectively persuaded their own faculties, much less the rest of the higher educational enterprise, or the rest of American society, that we really understand what scholarship is and are seriously concerned about the production of scholarly work on our own campuses. Indeed, we have been sadly remiss in doing scholarship in those precise areas which ought to have been of great concern to the American Church—the history and the sociology of American Catholicism, the ethical problems of business life, and especially the moral and biological issues involved in population control. I do not deny that some efforts have been made along these lines, but I simply affirm that what has been done has been woefully inadequate.

You will argue, and you will argue quite correctly, that some of the great scholars of American Catholicism are Jesuits. But I will say to you in reply that you have not always supported your scholars the way you ought to have supported them. You have overworked them, you have failed to encourage them when they have encountered opposition, and on occasion you have made their lives unbearably difficult. I will concede that some scholars, like some human beings, are difficult people to deal with, but I often feel that the lack of support from their community has been a tragic mistake. The particular case that angers me most is that of Father John Courtney Murray. Why he did not receive more support from American Jesuits in the early days of his writing on the Church-State issue completely escapes me. Where were the American Jesuits when he was attacked in the pages of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*? Where were the American Jesuits when his freedom to write was impeded if not curtailed? Where were his Jesuit confreres when he was “disinvited” to the first session of the Vatican Council? You may very well take credit for Father Murray’s victories at the Council, but in so doing remember that you did not support him when he really needed your support and, in the final analysis, this shall not be forgiven you.

My third general observation about the problems of Jesuit higher education is that there still exists strong strains of paternal-

ism and familialism which, even though they are being replaced by standards of professionalism and collegiality, are not disappearing nearly fast enough. So many of your colleges were, at least in their early days, merely extensions of high schools and the mentality which governs high schools has, to some extent, survived in the governance of Jesuit colleges. At one time, it was quite legitimate to speak of the "Jesuit family" at a university. There was also a time when for all practical purposes the Jesuit community and the university were one and the same thing. It is, of course, obvious that this is no longer the case. Yet, at least in some instances, this identification of the university with the Society continues despite protestations to the contrary and appearances to the contrary. Those lay people who are placed in positions of responsibility in the colleges are, at least on occasion, people characterized more by their loyalty to the local Jesuit order than by their scholarly or administrative ability, and the students and faculty members are not deceived by these appearances of lay participation. At one Jesuit college where there are a considerable number of lay people in positions of apparent responsibility, many students contemptuously dismiss the laity (who are praised by the administration as loyal members of the university family) as lay-finks. Apparently, it is going to take some time before all educators understand that the appearances of sharing power are not the same thing as the actual sharing of power.

There may be many older members of your faculty who were trained in your own schools or in other Jesuit schools who have little or nothing in the way of scholarly productivity and who may be quite content and happy to be the lay auxiliaries in the Jesuit family at a given university. But this kind of lay faculty member is a fading phenomenon. The young people who are coming to your schools in the junior faculty positions are professionally oriented and, whether you like it or not, they will continue to be professionally oriented. In many schools they simply do not trust you because they do not think that you trust them. They are not persuaded that you do not think, in your heart of hearts, that the school is yours and that they are simply tolerated as second class citizens who, in the final analysis, do not have any personal involvement in the school or any right to participate in its direction. Let me stress that this is not true of all your schools. It may not even be true of the majority of them to any substantial

extent. What I am speaking of are trends to be observed, at least to some extent, on certain Jesuit campuses. Unless a serious attempt is made to eliminate distrust that is to be found among some of the best of your young lay faculty, then I suspect that you are going to have rather serious problems in years to come.

Nor is the spirit of paternalism at all dead in the dealings of Jesuit administrations with students who, in many instances I fear, are treated insofar as possible like high school students would have been treated a generation ago. Student papers operate often under the most repressive of restrictions and censorship. Student organizations enjoy little or no freedom to bring in speakers of their own choosing from outside the campus. Student religious life is marked by compulsion, by the mechanical repetition of exercises, by slovenly performance of the liturgy, and by a total lack of any dynamic and challenging program of religious development in tune with the spirit of the Vatican Council. Student rules are elaborate, complicated, difficult to understand, and in practice unenforceable, and punishments for violation of rules are likely to be arbitrary and without appeal. Whatever is to be said of this form of student discipline and student life as a carryover from an earlier and better age, the best that can be said about it for the present time is that it simply does not work. Once again, I am speaking not of all Jesuit schools, but of a tendency observed in some Jesuit schools.

The principles of professionalism in administration and scholarship, the principles of collegiality in relationship with faculty and students are absolutely essential for American higher education in years to come. You must display the same kinds of professionalism and collegiality which are to be found in the best non-Catholic schools; you must ask yourselves whether secularists have arrived at these thoroughly Christian principles before us, because they have been truer to the great university tradition of the middle ages, a tradition which was once ours, than we have been ourselves. Will the replacement of paternalism and familism by professionalism and collegial government require a major internal organization of the Jesuit order? I must reply to this that as an outsider I cannot say. But I am inclined to think that at least some of the paternalistic and familistic elements which remain in the American Jesuit community have nothing to do with the spirit of St. Ignatius as I read him. It would have to do, rather, with historical and social conditions of by-gone years. Indeed,

speaking once again as an outsider, I have a strong suspicion that the collegiality and the professionalism that I am advocating are probably truer to the spirit of St. Ignatius than some of the abuses of these principles which are still to be encountered in Jesuit schools.

I pass to a fourth general criticism. We ought to ask ourselves what massive misunderstanding of Catholic higher education enabled us to permit our theology departments to sink into the sad state of disrepute and disrepair in which they presently are to be found. Why, in so many, many instances, are theology departments not the best thing on campus but rather the worst? Why are they taught so often, even now, by people who are unable to teach anything else? Why are they taught by people who have no professional training and, what is worse, no sense of new developments in the Church? Why do we have good science departments, good English departments, good history departments, even an occasional good sociology department, but, with precious few exceptions, theology departments that range from fair to incredibly bad? Some of you will tell me that the theology departments are improving, and I will say, "it is high time". You will say that there are one or two or three that are approaching excellence, and I will say, "why so few?" You will maintain that there are now men in training who will, in a few years, create many more excellent theology departments, and I will want to know "why have they only recently been sent into training?" There are many of the problems and the difficulties of Catholic education and of Jesuit higher education which can be explained by the social and historical condition in which we find ourselves, but for the abysmal state of most of our theology faculties I think there is no explanation, no justification. This has been a failure—an incredible failure—and one which we must correct with all possible speed.

Having leveled these four general criticisms, let me descend more briefly to specific criticisms. First of all, is it a good thing for administrators to be the trustees of the university so that for all practical purposes they are the only ones sitting in judgment on their own work? Is it not possible that this identification of administrator with trustee makes it easy for a clique of men to preserve themselves in power, to resist all pressures for change, not only from the lay faculty, but also from their Jesuit confreres?

Second, is it a good thing to identify the role of rector with the

role of president or is it not to give one man too much power for him to be the unquestioned ruler of the religious community and also the head of an academic community? Is it possible for Jesuit faculty members to relate to their administrator in a professional fashion when there exists also the very different role relationship of religious superior to religious subject? Can we expect widespread growth and improvement when the power of the president of the university is absolute and unchecked as the power of a Jesuit rector-president often is?

Three, is it a good thing to have a situation where the top level administrators are necessarily selected from the Jesuit community? Can we expect various provinces of the Jesuits to consistently produce enough men with the interest, the ability, the training, and the inclination to serve as college administrators, or ought not some whole new rationale of selecting university administration be established? Might it not be much more in keeping with the spirit of the Jesuit community that the rather unexciting and routine responsibilities of administration not be committed to the care of Jesuit fathers who probably could be much more effective in the classroom or in the counseling role?

What is to be said of the pastoral role of the Jesuit who is also a scholar? Is his total apostolate merely the apostolate of his academic work or ought he not at least have some free time to play more directly and immediately a pastoral role in relationship with his students? But if we are to expect him to be spontaneously scholar and pastor (as the lay faculty are simultaneously scholar, parent and spouse) must we not give him the kind of free time necessary to play the pastoral role? Do we not make, in fact, demands on the time of our religious faculty that we would not dare make on the time of our lay faculty?

Furthermore, do we not put men into roles of counseling and student supervision who frequently are completely untrained for these roles and unhappy in them? Ought we not establish the role of student counselor or student supervisor as something every bit as professional as the role of professor of physics and give the men who are assigned these roles every bit as adequate a professional training?

Why is there so much resistance to faculty senates of the authentic variety? Why do some Jesuit schools drag their feet on matters of faculty rights and privileges and faculty participation? Why does this seem, in many instances, to be an almost compulsive

fear of losing control of even the smallest decision-making area in the school? Why do some Jesuit administrators appear both to their faculty and to outsiders to be terribly frightened and threatened men?

Why does there seem to be at least something of an inclination within the community to pick safe rather than dynamic administrators? Is there a fear that the dynamic administrator who could truly move a school ahead will offend too many people within the community and when he returns to the community after his term of administration is over find himself unwelcome? Is there something about the Jesuit order which inclines it to the timid rather than the exciting administrator? I am, of course, in no position to answer this question and surely there are enough dynamic Jesuit administrators in the country to show what the answer to the question is. And yet, I cannot escape the impression in my wanderings around Jesuit universities that at least in some instances the people who have been given positions of responsibility are not terribly interested in these positions and indeed do not have the vigor, the vision, and the force to meet the challenge that the position offers. As one somewhat cynical Jesuit said to me, "If Ted Hesburgh were a Jesuit he would be the dean of men at one of our small liberal arts colleges. If Jim Shannon were a Jesuit he would be either director of alumni relations or a moderator of the Sodality. And if Coleman Barry were a Jesuit he would have been driven out of the order". How much of an exaggeration this comment is I leave to your own judgment, but I think you would make a serious mistake if you felt that it did not indicate the existence of a real problem.

Is there not a possibility that the Jesuit system of censorship which gives a censor far more decision-making power than merely determining whether the writing is in keeping with faith and morals, not a serious obstacle to scholarly research? It is not likely that when a scholar has trouble time and time again with censors with matters not pertaining to faith and morals he will be inclined to give up and not to bother. I know of one young man who wrote a paper for one of my classes which I recommended that he publish in a scholarly journal, a journal of which, by the way, I happen to be one of the editors. The paper was promising, indeed, with a touch of brilliance about it, it addressed itself to an extremely important problem. One of the two censors approved the paper without question but the other affirmed that

the paper was too inconclusive for a young man to be publishing and refused approval. Needless to say, I was and am quite angry about this because I seriously doubt that the man who evaluated the paper is capable of judging its worth and because the community's refusal to permit him to publish his paper was a reflection not only on the young Jesuit in question but also on my judgment as a teacher and as an editor. I wonder how many more times this sort of arbitrary abuse of a person's freedom will be necessary before that young man gives up all interest in a scholarly publication.

Is it true that incompetent men are often maintained in positions of academic responsibility (particularly as departmental chairmen) simply because they are Jesuits and the Jesuit superior provincial doesn't know what else to do with them? Is it true that men are assigned to academic departments at Jesuit universities without the departmental chairman, be he lay or Jesuit, being given the privilege of reviewing the man's credentials and accepting him or rejecting him for employment in the department? Is it true that the very late entry of Jesuits into scholarly work because of the incredibly lengthy preparation for ordination cuts short academic careers which could be much more fruitful than they are? Is there any justification in modern society for the extremely late age at which a Jesuit begins his scholarly activity? Is it true that the most restless of the Jesuits are the younger men who have been trained in the secular universities and then come back to the Jesuit schools with high standards of scholarly professionalism to find that these standards are ignored and formally rejected in their own universities? How true these accusations are you men may judge more readily than I but I beseech you not to write them off as the complaints of merely a few malcontents. It is my impression that the men I have heard voice these criticisms are some of the most loyal and dedicated Jesuits in the country.

Is there not a strong need for a clear distinction between the Jesuit order, the trustees of the university, and the administration of the university? Is it possible for Jesuit colleges to be truly professional in the highest sense of the word when these three distinct bodies overlap with each other, when it is impossible on many occasions to tell where one ends and the other begins? Is it not absolutely necessary that a new kind of common law emerge whereby the rights and privileges and freedoms of each of these three bodies, order, trustees, and administrators, be clearly

established? Indeed, does it not seem that the Jesuit order is saddled with far too much responsibility in the administration of universities and would be much better off if not only were the universities to some extent free of the order but also if the order was to some extent free of the great burden of the universities? Mind you, I am not in any sense advocating the end of Jesuit higher education or the dissolution of the tight bonds between the Jesuit order and the Jesuit universities. What I am suggesting, at least for the sake of discussion, is that a restructuring of the relationship between the Society and its universities might be beneficial both to the Society and the university. Exactly what shape this new relationship would take seems to me to be a subject far beyond the limitation of this morning's paper.

Finally, is it not possible that with twenty-eight colleges and universities Jesuit higher education may well be spread out too thin? Does there not seem to be a tendency for the various provinces to compete with each other and for the various colleges and universities to compete with each other? Ought not there be more efforts at establishing one or two or three university campuses as the very best in Jesuit higher education to which all provinces and all universities will send some, if not all, of their top flight men? I realize, of course, this subject of university centers has been discussed among you before, but I would insist with all the power at my command that we need at least one or two Jesuit universities who will rank among the top twenty of American universities and we need this school or schools just as quickly as possible.

I have spent a long time on these criticisms. I've been as blunt and honest as charity permits and maybe perhaps have on occasion strayed beyond the limits of charity. Let me say by way of justification I do this as one who is profoundly concerned with the future of Jesuit higher education. Let no man among you say that what you do with your schools is your business and not mine because, in a very real sense of the word, you are not your own. The American Jesuits and the American Jesuit colleges and universities belong to all of us who claim to be Catholics, and all of us have the right and indeed the obligation to make known our hopes and our fears about you.

I now turn to the final section of my presentation in which I will describe what I take to be some of the paths toward solutions to the problem of Jesuit higher education. I would, first

of all, contend Jesuit higher education must make a wholehearted acceptance of the changes going on within Catholic education. You must cease lamenting the professionalism of the younger faculty. You must cease to resist the demands for freedom and for personal fulfillment which is characteristic of the new breed of your students. You must have done with compulsion and restriction in student life. You must make your theology classes and your religious programs so attractive that more people will want to become involved in them than there is room to be involved and the question of compulsion will become irrelevant. You must enthusiastically accept the fact that your schools are now indeed public colleges and universities not, as a matter of fact, in their ownership but in their responsibility, in their willingness to share power with the various publics that are deeply involved in the future of the university. You must bravely concede that for the foreseeable future you will have to deal with critical laity on your faculties, in your student bodies, increasingly within your administrations themselves, and in the Catholic press. You must accept the fact that intelligent American Catholics will demand the same standard of excellence from your institutions as are being demanded from the very best of American colleges and universities. You must learn to live with the American Association of University Professors and its insistent demands for academic freedom for faculty and students. You must realize that for weal or woe, the past it past, and those techniques and attitudes and organizational measures which sufficed for Jesuit education in the twenties and the thirties, even in the forties and the fifties, will have to be re-evaluated to see if they are functional in the sixties and seventies.

You must, secondly, build at least one great university which, if it is not a Harvard or a Yale or a Princeton, is at least a Cornell or an NYU. Such a university will require considerable sacrifices from other schools and probably from other provinces, but I think that at this stage of the game of Catholic higher education, you do not have an option in the matter. Those of us who are inclined to defend Catholic higher education against its violent and at times irrational critics within the Church must be able to point to at least one or two schools and say, "This place is as good as almost any college or university in the country." You must do this and you must do it soon.

Thirdly, I think you have to do all in your power to eliminate the impression of the we-they separation which the lay people

in Jesuit institutions frequently feel exists. I have nothing but the highest admiration for the tremendous community spirit which the Jesuits display and yet you must realize this great internal loyalty which your order has always generated can, unless great care is taken, be interpreted as clannishness from the outside, a clannishness which excludes all who are not part of the order. You say that laity on your campuses are not second class citizens, but, unfortunately, many of them feel that they are and at least on occasion can cite extremely convincing evidence that some of you, in practice if not in theory, think they are.

Fourthly, you must persuade the lay faculty and the student body that you sincerely and honestly trust them, that you recognize their own approach to higher educational institutions may be different from your approach, but that this diversity, in your judgment, is a positive good for the university and not something that troubles you or causes you fear of the loss of control. You must give evidence both in word and deed that the greatest possible *freedom* of both the lay faculty and student body is of the *essence of the Jesuit approach to higher education* and that it is the avowed policy of Jesuit institutions to pursue this freedom with all possible vigor.

You must make clear and definite distinctions between the Order, trustees, and administration, so that the Order is not saddled with the responsibility of the day to day administration of the university, so that the trustees are not either mere rubber stamps for the administration, on the one hand, or provincial on the other, and that they are not merely different manifestations of the school administrators sitting in judgment on their own efforts. Your trustees must become authentically operating policy-making boards, composed preferably not only of Jesuits but also of competent Catholic laity and perhaps even members of other religious faiths.

You must, it seems to me, maintain the highest standards of professionalism in the administration of your schools and the demands you put on your faculty. You must come to realize that professionalism, the demand for excellence in administration, teaching, and in research, is an extraordinarily important Christian virtue, that it represents the incarnating of the Church in the world, and that profound concern of the Church over human culture of which the fathers of the Second Vatican Council spoke so frequently. Anything that is shoddy, anything that is shabby, anything that is second-rate, anything that is makeshift,

anything that is incompetent must be rejected out of hand as being simply unthinkable in Jesuit higher education.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, you simply cannot tolerate poor theology departments. You cannot tolerate them even for another year, or for another semester. If there is one reform that is absolutely essential if Catholic higher education be justified in any way, it is the reform of the theology departments, a reform which, let me say it once again, simply cannot be delayed for one more day.

There can be no doubt that I have said some harsh words this morning, but I have said them in the context of great optimism and great hope and great confidence in the future of Jesuit higher education. There can be no doubt, gentlemen, that you are involved in a severe crisis at the present time, but I am absolutely convinced that it is a crisis of growth and not of decline. What I am demanding of you today is that you live up to the best of your own Jesuit tradition, that you have the courage to understand that at the present time the standards demanded of you by the larger American educational enterprise and by the Catholic laity are the standards demanded of you by the writings of your founder.

What those of us who are onlookers are trying to say to you is that far from being any conflict between the best in American higher education and the best in the Jesuit tradition, the two come, in the final analysis, to the same thing. If we are right, then the path ahead for you is clear. If you do not have the courage to follow that path, then you simply do not deserve to survive. However, I, for one, have no doubt that you will survive and survive in the finest traditions of the Society of Jesus.

In Response to Father Greeley

PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of all here in thanking Father Greeley for such a frank and searching analysis of the problems besetting Jesuit colleges and universities at the present time. Although, to quote his words, he "had some harsh things to say," I think that he also made it abundantly clear that he was aware of the dangers of generalizing about twenty-eight institutions which actually are quite different in many ways. Moreover, in true Ignatian style, Father Greeley has followed Father Yanitelli's orders to the letter, avoiding comment on any characteristics of our colleges and universities which might be worthy of commendation. Personally, I am particularly grateful for Father Greeley's forthright statement because when the Fathers Provincial recently appointed me as President of the Jesuit Educational Association, their instructions concerning my duties were rather vague. Just in time, Father Greeley has presented me with a specific mandate which should keep all of us quite busy for a long time. I have decided to arrange my comments under three headings:

(a) A brief statement of the major points in Father Greeley's paper with which I agree;

(b) Some points with which I do not agree or which I think need further clarification, as well as a problem which is not identified by Father Greeley at least explicitly; and

(c) More specific expansion of some of his recommendations.

I. *POINTS OF AGREEMENT:*

I agree wholeheartedly with Father Greeley's perceptive analysis of the condition of the Catholic Church in America at the present time. We are passing through a period of traumatic transition, as he puts it, "from slum to suburb, and from the Tridentine Church to the Vatican Church." I, too, am convinced that in spite of the widespread secularism which seems to characterize contemporary America, our nation is built on and dedicated to fundamental religious principles. Finally, no one can disagree with that other characteristic of the American Catholic Church, namely, the emergence of the layman as a necessary and vital force in policy-making and administration of every facet of the Church's program.

Historically accurate, also, are the four major problems which Father Greeley identifies with Jesuit higher education. He is not the only one who has complained about the "unplanned and chaotic growth" of most of our colleges and universities. Like most American colleges, too we are endeavoring to struggle up from beginnings that were quite unscholarly in their orientation. Thirdly, our Jesuit schools at every level do manifest the same characteristics of paternalism and familialism so indigenous to the Catholic school system. And fourthly, with shame, I admit that in most of our colleges and universities the teaching of theology did reach a disgracefully low level in comparison with the professional demands of the other departments in our institutions. As I will point out later, these four may not necessarily be the four most serious problems we are facing, but certainly in any list which a well informed critic would compile these four would be very close to the top.

II. *POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT, OF CLARIFICATION, AND OF ADDITION:*

1. In his concluding comments on the first problem of Jesuit higher education—the unplanned growth of our institutions, Father Greeley says, "We cannot continue with this fantastic multiplication of colleges without having some justification for what we are doing and for the way we are expanding." First of all, in the context of this paper it might be assumed that Father Greeley was complaining that colleges under Jesuit auspices are multiplying fantastically. Actually, of course, this is not the case.

Of our 28 institutions, 22 were founded before 1900. Five others, Fairfield, LeMoyné, Loyola in Los Angeles, Loyola in New Orleans, and Rockhurst were founded since 1900 but prior to World War II. Only one, Wheeling, has been founded during this post-World War II period which has been characterized by the explosive establishment of new colleges in this country.

More probably, Father Greeley's comment about fantastic multiplication is being applied to all Catholic colleges. Even in this case I think it is important that we examine the facts very carefully. As many of you will remember, at the NCEA Atlantic City meeting in 1964, I delivered a talk in which I complained among other things about the "alarming evidence of excessive unplanned proliferation of new Catholic colleges." As a result of this paper, the Executive Committee of the College and University Department of the NCEA has been conducting a study,

financed by the Ford Foundation, to secure as accurate information as possible about the current status of Catholic colleges in America, whether or not they are proliferating and at what rate, what clientele they are serving, etc.

The results of this study, under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Ford of St. Louis University, will be published sometime this fall, but even now we have some information relative to this point of proliferation. Sister Formation Colleges, frequently cited as the "culprit," are still being opened, but at a decelerating rate. Preliminary findings of the study indicate that the proliferation in the recent past of such colleges must not be attributed categorically to a lack of planning or foresight on the part of religious superiors who embarked on such ventures. A considerable share of the responsibility must be shouldered by larger, well-established institutions which showed little interest in finding suitable alternatives. The question of proliferation will be clarified and dealt with in more detail in the final report. There remains the possibility that Jesuit institutions, although not guilty of "internal" proliferation, may have to shoulder a portion of the responsibility for the proliferation of Catholic higher education in general.

2. You will recall that after listing the four major problems which he feels are plaguing Jesuit higher education, Father Greeley then lists a long series of more specific criticisms couched in the form of questions which he has heard raised by Jesuits on one campus or another. The final question in his list reads as follows: "Is it not possible that with 28 colleges and universities, Jesuit higher education may well be spread out too thin?" Buried perhaps in this question are two implied positions with which I am inclined to disagree:

(a) The first is the implication that at this point in our history it is realistic to suggest that we ought to reduce the number of Jesuit colleges to some number smaller than 28. While I would be inclined to agree that it might have been better if all 28 of our colleges and universities had not been founded, I think the only practical point for us now is to take the position that only irrefutable evidence should induce us to start the 29th institution. But, in the meantime, in line with many of the very helpful suggestions and recommendations contained in Father Greeley's paper, instead of considering seriously what I would judge as the hopeless and unrealistic task of trying to close any of our colleges in an atmosphere today which is demanding more rather

than less educational opportunity, let us define the proper individual role of each of these 28 institutions. Then let us set out with greater determination than ever in the past to keep each of them moving towards and within their proper role, but never beyond their potential. And I am talking here not merely about the danger of our four-year colleges ambitioning to become complex institutions. The warning that we must stay within our potential is even more an imperative for our large complex institutions than it is for our smaller ones.

(b) Also implicit in Father Greeley's question as to whether we are spread too thin is the assumption that we could build much better Jesuit colleges and universities if we could gather more of our Jesuits into fewer institutions. While I do not deny that, absolutely speaking, one Jesuit college with 50 well-trained Jesuit professors should be better than two Jesuit colleges with 25 equally well-trained Jesuits, nevertheless, I think it should be insisted on that the problem of over-reaching our potential is not simply a factor of Jesuit manpower. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is even one of the major considerations in this question. Strengthening Jesuit higher education is not a matter of bringing more Jesuits together. Simply doing this, for example, might strengthen the Department of Theology in a given institution but unless several other factors are also operative and particularly the factor of financial resources, merely concentrating more Jesuits in fewer institutions might weaken rather than strengthen our total educational efficiency.

3. The question just discussed leads quite naturally to what I would consider the major omission in Father Greeley's listing of problems besetting Jesuit higher education. In my view, the overriding problem of Jesuit colleges and universities is the fact that they are under-financed. There are several reasons why I think it is absolutely imperative that any identification of problems include under-financing at or near the top of the list. First of all, in fairness of most of the Jesuit administrators whom I know, it would be false to imply that they have been slow to solve many of the problems which Father Greeley has accurately described because of a lack of appreciation of the importance of academic excellence or because of sheer inertia or laziness. In my own institution, and we are not unique in this, I have spent too many hours observing the agony suffered by academic administrators desperately eager to attract more scholarly faculty, to raise inade-

quate salary levels, to establish all the accouterments necessary for nourishing an intellectual atmosphere, but finding nothing but frustration at every turn because of an inadequate supply of financial resources. Much of the lack of planned growth, much of the failure to improve faculties generally and specifically in theology, is due to the thinness of staff which militates against providing faculty with added growth opportunities which in turn is due to inability to afford the added expenses that this process necessarily involves.

One of the implications, therefore, which I think deserves to be refuted is any generalization that we are unaware of many of these deficiencies or unwilling to take the necessary means to remedy them. On the other hand, however, I wish quickly to attack another facet of this matter of financial inadequacy by stating that I honestly feel that most of our colleges and universities could have more financial resources than is the case at the present time. I am convinced that, like many Catholic institutions, we Jesuits have not done all we could to establish within our colleges and universities well-organized development programs. No college of Ours can be satisfied that its future is secure until it has in operation a program of continuing voluntary support from corporations, foundations, individuals, alumni, parents, and students. Such support from multiple sources will be needed over and above the financial assistance from the Federal Government which happily has been on the increase in recent years. Religious as well as lay staff must be trained and dedicated to this recognized and respectable area of college and university life.

Yes, the major problem facing Jesuit colleges is under-financing, and even if we should honestly be able to say that our college has an on-going development program which is tapping every conceivable source of support, it is my conviction that there will still be a question as to what the proper role of Jesuit as well as other Catholic, as well as all private colleges and universities should be in the light of the financial competition with which we must contend from tax-supported and heavily endowed private institutions. Every problem listed by Father Greeley could be solved by most of us within the next ten years, *if* we can muster the financial resources necessary just to keep within our present objectives without any excessive expansion or proliferation of our educational goals.

4. I should also like to take exception to Father Greeley's

too general accusation that we have not supported Jesuit scholars in enabling them to push forward their research work or in protecting them against unfair or unscholarly criticism or censorship. While I am sure that there are exceptions of which we cannot be proud, there is a long list of Jesuits in a widespread spectrum of the sciences and humanities where Jesuits have been given complete freedom and total financial support to develop themselves into outstanding scholars. The only cases in which this type of support and defense may not be too evident, and this is the instance which Father Greeley explicitly mentioned, may have occurred in those areas of scholarship in which Jesuits have fallen into conflict with ecclesiastical authority. Some hesitancy to enter the lists with bishops and Roman officials can, I believe, be looked on with understanding, but cases of this kind, I feel, should not be used as in any way typifying what the Society has normally done on behalf of her men who had the qualifications and desire for scholarly achievement.

III. EXPANSION OF SOME OF FATHER GREELEY'S RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. I think it would be helpful if we attempted a more careful classification of the problems which Father Greeley has so accurately identified. Specifically, I would suggest that all of these problems might be classified in three categories, each of which requires a somewhat different approach. First of all, some of our problems are those which are common today to all American colleges and universities. In this category, of course, would go the frightening problem of under-financing which I have added to Father Greeley's litany as well as such other problems as those related to student insistence on less paternalism, etc. In attacking this type of problem we in Jesuit higher education should not only consider their nature within our own institutions, but should attack them with the common body of American educators, endeavoring to learn from the research and experimentation that is going on everywhere.

There is a second category of problems which are unique to Catholic (Jesuit) colleges and universities in the United States. I am thinking, for example, of the problem of the relationship of our educational institutions to religious superiors, the question of our administrators' relationship to trustees, etc.

Thirdly, there is another set of problems which are unique to Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States in contrast

to our educational institutions in other parts of the world. Here it is most important that we be convinced of the wisdom of Father Greeley's advice that ours are American problems, requiring American solutions. This maxim points up the importance of our joint efforts to oppose the idea that we should centralize the attack on our educational problems at the Roman Curia level. I was happy to note, for example, that at the recent meeting of representatives of Province Prefects in Spain the original proposal to establish a world-wide Director of Jesuit Education was voted down. "American solutions to American problems" also demands that we foster better communications in order to acquaint higher superiors with the unique nature of the cultural problems affecting our educational efforts in the United States. It is my impression that Very Reverend Father General is quite aware of this situation and for that reason is eager to move out of Rome in order to understand varying national situations better. For the same reason, we and the General Congregation are insisting that our Regional Assistants spend more time in their respective countries.

2. Second only to the problem of under-financing is the problem which Father Greeley highlights in several parts of his paper, namely, the problem of the relationship of central ownership, authority, and administration to the many persons and agencies involved in the operations of a college or university, e.g., the Jesuit Order and individual Jesuits, the lay faculty, students, the public in general, or the public as represented by lay boards, etc. Within this complicated problem of relationships I think there are two of primary concern:

(a) Each of our colleges and universities should revise its legal structure in order to bring the administration of our institutions into line with the recognized sound policy that the Trustees, namely the moral person which is responsible for the institution legally and financially, must somehow be distinguished from those persons who are responsible administratively for carrying out the policies established by the Trustees.

(b) Each of our institutions must put into operation a faculty constitution which will provide an organized, recognized, and operative structure whereby all faculty members may express opinions and participate in those areas of policy formation in which they have appropriate competence.

3. The problem which is most crucial, not for each of our

individual institutions but for all of American Jesuit higher education combined, is the crying need for a much more specific national plan for the development of Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States. This badly-needed task simply cannot be performed by overburdened Provincials at their semi-annual meetings; it cannot be performed by experienced staff members of the Provincials' Curias, since few if any of them have such personnel available; up until now it has not been attempted by the Jesuit Educational Association generally or by any of its commissions or committees. It is my feeling that an attempt to begin to develop such a national plan is the primary responsibility of the Coordinating Committee of the JEA, and I intend to present this challenge to them at their first meeting in the near future. Obviously, such a plan will only be valid if it is developed by those who are immediately involved in our educational endeavors in this country both on the secondary and higher levels. Hence, much of the research work that will be necessary for developing such a plan will have to be assigned to the four commissions, particularly the Commissions on Secondary Schools and on Colleges and Universities, but the primary responsibility for coordinating and eventually producing a proposed plan to be submitted to the Board of Governors should come from the Coordinating Committee, a body which in the new constitution of the JEA should adequately represent all the elements of Jesuit education in this country.

4. In connection with this first major problem, that of more orderly development of Jesuit higher education, Father Greeley points out a specific requirement which I think needs greater attention than has been given it in the past. Father Greeley says: "Jesuit higher education at the present time is in desperate need of a *new comprehensive rationale* for its existence, and I am further saying that none of those presented thus far seem to me to be particularly convincing." My first reaction to this statement was to ask whether or not Father Greeley had read the report of the Loyola Workshop in 1962 and particularly the very carefully prepared statement on the "Ideal Jesuit College Graduate." Although I still believe that serious efforts to define the unique kind of product we are attempting to educate is a valuable exercise, nevertheless, after further consideration I am inclined to agree with Father Greeley that a much more practical and convincing argument for the unique contribution of our institutions can be developed along the lines which he indicates in his paper,

namely, that ours are unique institutions in which certain things take place which cannot take place elsewhere, e.g., "where the Church does its thinking, . . . where certain theological and ecclesiastical positions are handed down, . . . where a community of Christians can come together in some sort of free and open religious life." In other words, we might be much better understood if we could demonstrate to the rest of Americans, not that our graduates are really identifiably different from those of other institutions, but that in our institutions there are certain opportunities available for the total Christian development of young men and women that simply are not and cannot be made equally available elsewhere.

A Commentary

MANNING M. PATILLO

We have heard two excellent addresses this morning—one a telling recital of weaknesses in Jesuit higher education and a challenging call to reform by a critical but constructive observer, and the other a dispassionate commentary by a responsible university administrator. The two papers together provide a very useful agenda for Jesuit colleges and universities, for the Association, and, I would say, for Catholic higher education generally. So many thoughtful observations have been brought together for careful examination and, let us hope, for incorporation into the planning of the institutions you represent.

Can we not agree with most of what has been said? Surely, we can accept Father Greeley's diagnosis of the rapid changes occurring in American Catholicism—the assimilation of the Church and its people into the mainstream of national life, the restlessness and anxiety accompanying the process, the pervasive influence of ecumenism, and the insistence of the laity on having their proper place in the governance of the Church and its institutions. We recognize that Jesuit colleges and universities have grown without benefit of careful planning at the national level. Indeed, most of the institutions were established before we had developed the techniques of systematic educational planning. All of us would agree that, while there have been notable scholars in the Society of Jesus, the Jesuit universities and indeed Catholic universities in general have been less distinguished as centers of graduate study and research than have Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, California, Michigan, and others of the greatest universities in America. We acknowledge that the Catholic institutions have even been weak in areas where we should expect them to be strongest—the undergraduate teaching of theology, for example. We know all too well that Father Reinert is right when he emphasizes the point that inadequate financial support has been a serious deterrent to academic excellence.

Both speakers have probed the soft spots of paternalism and familialism and have urged that the roles of lay faculty members and students be strengthened and more clearly defined. We have

heard valuable recommendations with respect to needed changes in boards of trustees and administrative organization. Father Reinert's explanation of the desirability of a board which is independent of the administration was especially pertinent. The treatment of these problems this morning has been one of the best that I have heard, and I wish that many other college administrators and religious superiors could have been here.

Some searching comments have been made about the history and necessity of freedom in Jesuit institutions. This is an area in which great strides are being made in many Catholic colleges and universities, though this progress is not always acknowledged by the press and the intellectual world. Certainly, the encouragement of ever greater freedom should be an important objective of Jesuit higher education in the years to come. Doubtless, there will be damaging cases of infringement of freedom from time to time—incidents that will place Catholic institutions in the glaring light of unfavorable publicity. Every president, every board, and every faculty should be working hard right now to get their houses in order, so that they will be able to deal on the basis of sound principle with the cases that we know are coming. I thought one of the best points made by both Father Greeley and Father Reinert was that these steps should be taken before emergencies arise. As Father Greeley put it, in referring to restrictions that cannot be maintained, “. . . you will be much better advised to eliminate them with good grace while you can instead of having to give them up under pressure.”

I was impressed with what was said about the need for a new rationale for Jesuit higher education. This, of course, as Father Reinert pointed out, has not been wholly neglected. The volume *Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation*, edited by Fathers McGannon, Cooke, and Klubertanz, is a significant contribution to this very matter. But no single book can do the thinking for all of the institutions that must hammer out, if not an entirely new rationale, at least a sharpened and refined rationale which provides a convincing *raison d'être* in this period of history. If I were to mention the one most important conclusion that can be drawn from the Danforth study it would be that almost all church-related institutions need to sharpen their purposes and derive their educational programs more explicitly from their stated purposes than is now being done. This, though obvious, is almost universally overlooked. It is the central weakness of American higher educa-

tion and undermines so much of the potential effectiveness of the whole enterprise.

We have been given such an abundance of sound recommendations on which to reflect. What can a third speaker add? There are three points on which I want very much to say something, and I shall say it quite briefly:

1. We are hearing a great deal these days about secularity and secularism. We are being told over and over again by churchmen that secularity is a good thing, that far from being injurious or antithetical to the welfare of Christianity, it is actually a purified Christianity that brings the Church into a better working relationship with contemporary culture. This reasoning has become a kind of party line with a growing body of professionals in religion. I found it echoed in both of the previous papers.

Now, this is a consoling notion, and there is enough truth in it to make it attractive to all of us. Religion and life should not be separated. Religion should influence our daily lives, and the world is God's world. Archbishop Temple made the point well when he said, "It is a mistake to suppose that God is exclusively or even primarily concerned with religion."

But I do not believe that this says everything that needs to be said. If one reads contemporary theology fairly widely and looks carefully at what is going on in the broad spectrum of American churches, he may come to the conclusion that much of present-day thought and activity in the churches is really secular humanism in disguise. I am frankly concerned that if this movement, which is well intentioned, proceeds too far, we shall soon be asking the question whether the church and theology have distinctive roles to play. In fact, several talented younger theologians are now asking this precise question. And alert laymen are beginning to wonder about it. The "death of God" theology is only the most spectacular manifestation of a massive movement in theology which makes it more and more difficult to attach meaning to the world "God." John B. Cobb, Jr. has pointed out that the problem of God for theologians used to be that of adducing evidence of His existence. Now the debate has shifted, and the urgent question is whether the word "God" has any meaning at all. "Granted a certain sound is uttered from time to time, does any meaningful idea correspond to this sound?" asks Cobb. He answers the question in the affirmative, but some theologians and many educators do not. This is a non-theistic age, and theologians are

caught up in the assumptions of our time. We have, of course, always had non-theists, but now we have non-theistic theologians. I think it is significant that with the enormous amount of attention being given to the "death of God" theology in newspapers and popular magazines today there has been hardly any scholarly refutation of the new theology. In a serious discussion at a professional gathering of Protestant theologians recently, I raised gently the question of whether God was essential to the Christian Church, and no one wanted to deal with this question. The only responses that were made were to the effect that the new theology was helping to clear away a lot of outmoded piety. The larger question remains of what theology, as it is evolving, can contribute to our understanding that is not already being provided by philosophy, psychology, sociology, literature, and other disciplines. I find that theologians have not yet faced this question squarely. It is a question that is going to have to be faced in a secular age.

2. I share much of Father Greeley's admiration for the modern secular university. It has great virtues: a large degree of freedom, a climate of inquiry, high standards of scholarship, a remarkable research productivity, a capacity to manage large scholarly enterprises, and the ability to attract ever-increasing financial resources. But I hope that the Jesuit institutions, in emulating their more distinguished secular counterparts, will embrace the virtues without taking up the vices. And the modern university does have serious weaknesses—neglect of undergraduate teaching, bureaucratic inertia, and often a substitution of narrow technical competence for wisdom and broad understanding.

3. The previous speakers have said little about systematic research and experimentation as a means of improving institutions. The Catholic colleges and universities, by and large, have been deficient in this respect. With a few exceptions it is hard to find in Catholic higher education the aggressive spirit of curricular and instructional improvement that one sees at Antioch or Reed or Florida Presbyterian or Earlham or Stephens or Swarthmore or Wesleyan, to mention only a few pioneering colleges. The tendency of many Catholic faculties is to assume that there is only one way of doing things and it is useless to search for better ways. This leads to a somewhat mechanical approach which discourages imagination and handicaps the development of interesting and distinctive colleges. One of the primary roles of the good administrator is to give the faculty an appreciation of the wide range of

curricular and instructional possibilities and to encourage experimentation. How else can we improve the processes of teaching and learning? Every Catholic institution of reasonable size ought to have a director of institutional research who can give expert assistance to faculty members in planning experiments and appraising results.

Available—

**SOME NOTES ON THE TEACHING MANPOWER
OF THE JESUIT ORDER**

by William J. Mehok, S.J.

A sixty-three page statistical analysis and projection,
published in 1965.

One dollar; please send payment with order.

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036

A Psychiatrist Reflects on College Education

With Particular Reference to Jesuit Colleges and Universities

DANA L. FARNSWORTH, M.D.

It requires a considerable amount of temerity for someone with very little knowledge of the problems of Jesuit Colleges and Universities to appear before you, even in response to your own invitation, to discuss the issues which confront you and to make suggestions for improvement of your educational procedures.

That the reputation of your educational procedures is a formidable one, I do not need to repeat. Yet critical attitudes on the part of your students, and perhaps equally prevalent among yourselves and your faculty colleagues who are not here today, are strong and persistent. Someone said, in the 1920's I believe, that American education cannot have been too bad, else it would not have produced so many astute critics of itself. The discovery of the fact that the better the student, the more critical he is of his college experience is encouraging in one sense, but it does call for unusual courage on the part of college officials and considerable flexibility and restraint in the way their courage is expressed. Whether a quiet group of students is learning less than their more noisy colleagues is uncertain in my mind. At this stage of development what they are thinking may be more important for their future than what they are doing. Premature action based on incomplete knowledge and inadequate thought seems to me to be one of our present-day problems of our more aggressive students. What I am trying to say is that you should not become discouraged or feel unappreciated if you are the recipients of much criticism, even when it is unfair or undeserved, or when it comes from your own ranks. Perhaps you should be apprehensive if you were not being criticized; it might mean you were not being taken seriously.

Students as Agents of Change

Professor Rudolph of Williams College, a historian of American education, at a recent meeting of the American Council on Education made the provocative statement concerning educational reform in the 1820's and 1830's that if college officials "could not

bring the colleges to life, the students were prepared to prove that they could bring life to the colleges." He argues that students, rather than college administrators and faculty, have been the agents of change in American education. As he says, "For if a college cannot keep ahead of its students, students will surely get ahead of the college. Neglect demands response; the young do not refuse to act merely because they are not understood."

Professor Rudolph refers to the delicate balance of power held by the college president and the consciousness of their responsibilities held by college trustees and faculty members and then comments, "But students are not inhibited by any comparable self-consciousness. For a few years the college is their oyster, and they will have it served up exactly as they wish it, unless there are those who help them to some other, perhaps even wiser, choice."¹

Herein lies our task. How can we tap the enormous energies and curiosities of our students, together with their basic idealism, in such a way as to combine the best of our ideas and the best of theirs, and discard those concepts that both of us held that are no longer conducive to human progress? In doing this we will have to understand them, to respect them, and to tolerate their mistakes while helping them avoid making them again. We cannot do these things unless we know them. We cannot think of our students as a television actor might think of his audience—people, yes, but not quite real, and only to be considered in terms of whether or not they have their sets turned on.

Crisis in Values and Morals

Educators thrive on crises—they are dealing with them all the time. One has only to read the serious literary magazines to find dozens of things to worry about every month. But there is one situation of crisis proportions confronting all of us who deal with young people—the pervasive confusion concerning morals, values, standards, ethics or whatever term you like to describe the uncertainty confronting the students who look for guidelines by which they may plan their lives.

Many students have not yet learned to appreciate the difference between proper authority and authoritarianism (blind submission to an authority, usually one not constitutionally responsible to the people). They often resist the proper and necessary use of

¹ Rudolph, F., *Neglect of Students as a Historical Tradition*. From *The Student in Higher Education*, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1965, Pages 21-22.

authority because of this misapprehension and have often, especially in recent years, assumed that unlawful measures are justified to express their disapproval. Non-violent techniques have occasionally become violent; unduly repressive or other unwise tactics on the part of the duly constituted authorities then confirm the idea that the authorities are authoritarian. Violence escalates until some terrible event or series of events brings caution or common sense to the participants.

Those of us in psychiatry are quite alarmed over the ever increasing number of boys and girls who are being admitted to our mental hospitals. In all parts of the country the same phenomenon is being observed—an over-all reduction in the number of persons in mental hospitals, a sharp rise in the admission rate, and a shortening of the length of hospitalization. In contrast, there is this alarming increase in the serious disturbances of youth. In some urban communities conditions are so bad that the late adolescents have little choice other than becoming delinquent or becoming ill—on the whole the former is a more healthy way of reacting to unbearable conditions, though I hesitate to use the word healthy in such a context.

This increase in severe disturbances of the late adolescent period suggests that we look at the influences from society that give rise to such vulnerability to emotional stress. The effects of home, church, and school training may be undermined by forces in the larger society which undermine their security and give them little positive encouragement for those pursuits that call for hard and sustained effort. Notoriety may be mistaken for esteem.

Young people like heroes—but who are heroes because they are ethical? Many of the people who comprise the emulated group are those who make much money, grow long hair, sing wailing songs, acquire numerous wives or husbands (usually serially), or conspicuously display any combination of these or other equally unessential or repulsive forms of behavior. We cannot put exclusive blame on the entrepreneurs who promote these people and their activities; rather we should give much thought in our churches, schools, families, clubs, and other voluntary associations as to how we can raise people's tastes to such a degree as to render the antisocial or non-constructive activities unprofitable. You are, among other things, specialists in morals and values. Maybe you can help the rest of us devise better ways of making decency pay. Censorship doesn't work. Scolding is inad-

quate. Surely a society with as many intelligent people as ours should be able to find a way to make life meaningful for the late adolescent and the young adult. But we must first realize what the crisis is and why we must do something about it.

Signs of Student Confusion

Among college students who are having trouble in making the transition from adolescence to adulthood, a wide variety of signs of impending danger are apparent to those who can recognize them. Bizarre dress and hair grooming (or the lack of it), sexual "acting out," cheating, plagiarism and stealing, indiscriminate experimenting with drugs, acts signifying varying degrees of alienation from society, and the confusing of authority and authoritarianism, all suggest that the individuals exhibiting them are trying to cope with their varying and conflicting needs but not doing so very successfully. These students are not necessarily mentally ill, but unless they can move on to more satisfying ways of effecting solutions to their problems some of them will become so, or at least be unable to live up to anything near their true potential. These students cannot all be treated by psychiatrists and psychologists even if it were always desirable. It *is not* always desirable, some of them wouldn't want to be considered in need of help, and besides, there are not enough professional therapists available now or in the foreseeable future to meet more than a small fraction of the apparent need. The alternatives open to us are: (1) Ignore the students who exhibit deviant behavior, or (2) Develop in most of our teachers attitudes of concern and helpfulness, followed by the acquisition of the knowledge and skills which will enable them to work with these students in educational, not strictly therapeutic, terms. I should explain that deviant behavior as such does not bother me unless it is self-defeating in character or grossly disregardful of the rights and sensitivities of others.

New Teaching Opportunities

In my opinion the greatest opportunity now available for improvement of education in our colleges and universities is the development of closer interaction between professors and students. Some students have observed that in the "publish or perish" dilemma it is frequently the student who perishes. Students are often under strong pressures from their peers to avoid becoming involved with their teachers because of the possibility of some of them gaining thereby an unfair advantage over the others. Pro-

fessors are under pressure to undertake research and they in turn exert pressure for lighter teaching loads. The reward of good teaching is often the privilege of teaching less. The improvement of relations between teachers and students need not come from further exploitation of an already hard pressed and devoted group of professors. It must come from more imaginative recognition and utilization of situations in which students are eager and willing to learn. We should not have to be "shoved and kicked along the road to greater excellence."

When students become dissatisfied and critical of their colleges, and society as well, a major teaching opportunity exists. If their comments are countered with condescending advice, and they are told how impractical their suggestions are, the teaching opportunity disappears. If they are heard with care, and the issues clarified and shared with others, increased awareness of the possibilities and complexities which would result from the adoption of their suggestions almost always follows. But this is not a process that should be limited to exchanges between one college official and one student. Professors can no longer hold themselves aloof from the social, emotional, and ethical problems that are the daily concern of personnel workers any more than the latter can segregate their activities from the development of intellectual power—the prime purpose of the college.

Stated more provocatively, we cannot afford the luxury of professors who live only to promote understanding of their own discipline, nor can we be satisfied with personnel workers who are not interested in the academic activities of their colleges. Obviously there must be occasional exceptions. My colleague, Professor Crane Brinton,² cites a casual remark made about a young professor who could never be relied on to keep appointments or serve on committees or in general do the little duties expected of him: "Is Blank *really* good enough to be that bad?" Eccentricity and irresponsibility do not add to the effectiveness of a teacher any more than neurosis does to the accomplishments of a genius. Imbalance is desirable in professors as well as students so long as it consists of devotion to an ideal rather than blind protest.

Values Furthered by Mutual Examination

Since there are numerous avenues of approach to the improvement of higher education that are outside the range of my ex-

² Brinton, C. C., *A History of Western Morals*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1959, Page 7.

perience and competence, I will concentrate on only one aspect—the improvement of relations between professors and students. Whatever may be the advantages of teaching machines, audio-visual aids, information storage and retrieval systems, and all the other paraphernalia of education in this automated age, the teaching of values, character, responsibility, and integrity is not one of them. If I were required to identify what I would consider to be the chief weakness of our system of higher education at present, it would be the inadequacy of our methods of inculcating respect for the kind of values that enable our society to thrive and yet not to exploit individuals within it.

Not only have we not paid enough attention to how values are attained and transmitted from one generation to another, but we have managed to convey to many of our students a completely false view—that we are insincere or do not care about such matters. Too many young people feel alienated and are unable to commit themselves to causes in which they can use their energies in satisfying ways. While some are deploring the inadequacies of the young, others (and I among them) are saying that the present generation of college students is as idealistic, generous, and well informed as any in the past, and possibly even better endowed than any of their preceding generations. Yet something is missing—something dreadfully wrong—some opportunity is being missed. For some reason, many young people who are dissatisfied with the weaknesses of our society seem to prefer to disregard all its standards rather than just those which have shown themselves to be inadequate or inappropriate. The headmaster of a preparatory school recently told me that the officers of student government waited upon him this year and told him that he and his faculty were hypocritical and dishonest and that their actions were not to be trusted. Instead of scolding them, or ushering them out of his office, he reacted with genuine interest and began asking them questions. Finally one of the boys said, “Why, we are all hypocritical and dishonest at times, aren’t we?” The discussion ended on a note of understanding that the task ahead of them was one held in common rather than ideas of the faculty being superimposed on unwilling students.

What Can the Teacher Do?

What should we reasonably expect from a college teacher in an institution which is consciously devoting itself to making the entire

college experience conducive to learning? Obviously we will take it for granted that he should be competent in his own discipline, just as we always have (even though the teacher himself cannot always make the same assumption). He should make himself familiar with the developmental problems of the young adult, and try to remember some of the quandaries he faced when he was in college and graduate school. He should know something of the social, cultural, and spiritual background from which the students have come, together with the attitudes, ideals, goals, and aspirations they have brought with them to college. There is little opportunity and probably no need for the great majority of teachers to acquire this knowledge through formal courses. It is best acquired through reading key publications on these themes which are becoming ever more numerous, together with utilizing or developing opportunities for continuous discussion of such matters with psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, chaplains, and all the persons associated with the Dean of Students and his program for helping make education meaningful to students. It is not just a question of whether or not such knowledge is desirable; it is going to be necessary if teachers are to "keep ahead of their students." Students in American colleges are already ahead of their teachers in the basic understanding of the role of emotions in their own development, but they need help from people with similar sophistication and who have the wisdom that should come from age and experience.

What Should the Teacher Know?

Some professors misinterpret our pleas for greater understanding of their students, assuming that we expect them to be familiar with the personal life, quality, and background of each one of their students. This would be impossible, even if desirable. What psychiatrists and other counselors would like professors to know about students is more general—that behavior has causes which can be understood when the facts are known. These facts are often hidden from all the participants in any given human situation because of the mixtures of awareness and the lack of it concerning the objective factors involved as well as discrepancies between conscious and unconscious motivation. Students have unusual vulnerability to stress if their parents are in conflict, if there is a marked clash in the values of home and college, if they have not had good role models for emulation, or if they have not had firm, friendly,

and consistent discipline. Very bright youngsters may fail because they have never been required (by reason of their keen intelligence) to develop good study habits, or because they have become alienated from society (due to various admixtures of these handicaps) and see no meaning or ultimate purpose in what they are doing. Teachers of all disciplines should know something of the effects of social, cultural, ethnic, religious, racial, or other influences on students and the peer group pressures operating among them. They should particularly be aware of how attitudes are formed and spread through students and faculty as well as in the surrounding community. And they should know how to listen, perhaps the hardest task of all.

Learning without Wisdom is Barren and May Be Dangerous

In the process of making education a living and constant force among students (if I may borrow phrases from the Workshop Proceedings) the faculty's position is paramount. The professors (as well as administrators and trustees) must be concerned as much with what the students are thinking and how they feel about what is going on around them and within themselves as they are with what the students are doing. Learning without wisdom is barren and may be dangerous. A keen understanding of the "intelligent uses of freedom in the context of responsibility" and the development of "intelligent attitudes towards authority" are crucial, and these attributes can seldom be forcefully brought to the attention of students without personal interaction between faculty members and students. "Most decisions reflecting values are made outside the classroom, not in it," but I fear that many otherwise wonderful teachers are not aware of the teaching opportunities missed because of the apparent divorce between teaching and counseling.³ Teaching and counseling are so interrelated and so overlapping in their functioning that there should be no attempt to keep them rigidly separate.

Students Differ Widely from One Another

All too often the idea that students think alike, or that their interests and those of their teachers do not in general coincide is unwittingly accepted by many persons not familiar with college communities and even by some of those who are responsible for

³ The quoted phrases are from the proceedings of the 1965 *Student Personnel Workshop*, Regis College, Denver.

their welfare. In fact, students differ with one another fully as often as with their older colleagues on the faculty. When new and startling proposals are advanced, it is often helpful to encourage wide discussion among students of the possible consequences if they are adopted. This tends to put the emphasis on determining *what* is the right course to pursue rather than on *who* is right, which is only another way of saying that decisions should be made on their merits rather than on the superior power of those who uphold certain points of view. I do not mean to imply that all questions are debatable, and occasionally someone has to make the point forcefully. When this becomes necessary, widespread support from many sources is desirable. When excessive power becomes the possession of one individual or group, the possibility that it may be used unwisely is increased.

Intellectual Competence, Spiritual Development, and Mental Health Should Reinforce One Another

I think it becomes obvious from what I have said (which is essentially a restatement of the ideas developed in your previous workshops on personnel programs and services flavored with some of my own observations) that we have an enormous task ahead of us if we are to achieve unity in our educational goals. But it is a happy burden. No person is more fortunate than he who aids in the development of good character and motivation in the young person. He helps himself in the process fully as much as he helps the student. Nothing in the promotion of mental health interferes with the basic goals of the Jesuit colleges and universities (or any other educational institutions sponsored by the religious). I also believe that religion need not, and should not, impede the development of mental health in the individual. There is not, however, any strong consensus on this matter. Innumerable dialogues concerning the issues at stake are necessary. Education at a Catholic college should have all the qualities of excellence that any other college possesses but with an extra quality added—the steady powerful influence which the Church can exert toward the development of freedom *and* responsibility in both private and public life.

